DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 220 UD 011 524

AUTHOR	Walther, Regis H.
TITLE	A Study of Negro Male High School Dropouts Who Are Not Reached by Federal Work-Training Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	298p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Dropouts, Educational Background, *Employment Problems, Federal Programs, Individual Characteristics, Lower Class, *Males, *Negroes, Out of School Youth, Socioeconomic Status, *Southern States, Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland, Missouri

ABSTRACT

This is a report of research undertaken to investigate those characteristics of Negro male high school dropouts that might inhibit their participation in Federal Manpower Programs. Study groups, each composed of approximately 300 young men born before 1952, and who left school in 1966 and 1967 before graduating from high school, were constituted in Baltimore and St. Louis. Interviews were conducted during the summer of 1969, with 58 percent of the sample interviewed. An additional 25 percent were determined to be in military service, in jail, deceased, or in a hospital, and could not be interviewed. Seventeen percent of the sample could not be located. Field supervisors were designated for each study site; and within guidelines developed by the research staff, they were given full responsibility for hiring interviewers and organizing their work. All the interviewers were Negro and male, with the Baltimore staff being larger and the St. Louis staff being more diversified in terms of occupational background. (Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED050220

A STUDY OF NEGRO MALE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS WHO ARE NOT REACHED BY FEDERAL WORK-TRAINING PROGRAMS

Final Report
September, 1970

This project was prepared under Contract number 41-9-001-09 for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Researchers undertaking such projects under the Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment. Interpretations or viewpoints stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

UD011524

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator/Proj. Dir.
Margaret L. Magnusson, Research Associate
Shirley E. Cherkasky, Research Associate

Contract No. 41-9-001-09
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A research effort of the size of this study requires the cooperation of many people to bring it to a successful conclusion and we wish to express our appreciation to all of those who helped us. Jesse Davis, Harry Lieberman, and Richard Fogarty gave essential assistance both during the planning and initiation phases of the research and later while the research was conducted and the report written. Dr. Orlando Furno in Baltimore and Dr. Gerald H. Moeller in St. Louis and their staffs arranged the necessary clearances for us to obtain access to school records. The field supervisors, Mary Canada in St. Louis and Dorris Sukoneck in Baltimore, took on the difficult task of supervising the interviewing process and both achieved a highly respectable completion rate. Gwen O'Neill prepared the necessary computer programs, Maggie Carter supervised the coding operation, and Susan Stinson provided the necessary administrative assistance to keep the study moving and get out the final report. To each of the above we would like to express our appreciation and also to their staffs: Evelyn Lewis, Renée Tolcott, and Louise Jones for the coding operations, and Susan Lee and Rosa Harris for the administrative operations. Finally, we would like to thank the interviewers who worked so hard at locating the respondents, and to thank the youth who gave their time to help us with this research.

Highlights and Summary

This is a report of research undertaken to investigate those charcteristics of Negro male high school dropouts that might inhibit their participation in Federal Manpower Programs. Study groups, each composed of approximately 300 young men born before 1952, and who left school in 1966 and 1967 before graduating from high school, were constituted in Baltimore and St. Louis. Interviews were conducted during the summer of 1969, with 58 percent of the sample interviewed. An additional 25 percent were determined to be in military service, in jail, deceased, or in a hospital and could not be interviewed. Seventeen percent of the sample could not be located.

On the average, the subjects were 20.3 years of age at the time of interview and had completed slightly less than nine years of school, according to school records. About two-thirds of the subjects were reported by interviewers to have been "friendly, cooperative" during the interview, and one-fourth were reported to have been "casual, impersonal." "Reluctance", "suspicion", "hostility" or "indifference" was reported for only seven percent of the subjects. The attitudes of the subjects could, therefore, be considered generally conducive to good interviewing results.

Characteristics of Interviewed Subjects

--Ninety-one percent of the Baltimore subjects and 84 percent of the St. Louis subjects were living in or close to their birth states at the time of interview. Almost all of the Baltimore subjects not born in Maryland or adjacent states were born in North or South Carolina, while most of the St. Louis subjects, not born in Missouri or an adjacent state, were born in Mississippi

--Study subjects had lived in about four different places in the site city up to the time of interview.

--The median longest distance traveled from home during the month before the interview was reported to be 13 miles.

--Up to the time they left school, 60 percent of the subjects had lived in two-parent families and 30 percent, in mother-only families.

--In 38 percent of the families for which reports were received, the principal adult had completed eighth grade or less while 25 percent had completed high school. No report was given by 20 percent of the subjects.

--In 43 percent of the families, the principal adult was unskilled or had no occupation.

--Approximately 50 percent of the families had annual incomes the year before dropout of $4,000 or less.

--The number of persons in the household averaged 6.6.

--About 20 percent of the families had been on welfare all or most of the time.

--On the average, the subjects reported completing 9.5 years of school compared to slightly less than nine years reported by school records.

--St. Louis subjects gave "suspended or expelled" as principal reasons for leaving school, while Baltimore subjects gave "lost interest".

--Most subjects thought that their reading ability was "as good as" or "better than" that of the average high school graduate. They rated their math ability somewhat lower.

--About two-thirds of the Baltimore subjects and one-half of the St. Louis subjects reported that their schooling had been vocationally useless.

--Most of the subjects did not return to school after dropping out, and, of those who returned, most made little academic progress.

A few, however, (four percent) returned to school and completed the twelfth grade and an additional two percent completed the requirements for a high school equivalency certificate.

--Only seven percent of all interviewed subjects reported having enrolled in vocational courses after dropping out of school.

--Approximately 20 percent of the subjects were or had been married prior to date of interview.

--Approximately 30 percent of the subjects reported that they had children at the time of interview. Fourteen percent said that their children were living with them, and 17 percent said they were not.

--Approximately 80 percent of the subjects lived in their parental unit at the time of interview.

--Sixty-three percent of the subjects said that they were supported by their own earnings and 29 percent, by family earnings.

--The most frequently reported method of looking for jobs was to ask friends or relatives.

--Thirty-eight percent of the subjects said that most of their friends graduated from high school while 28 percent said that most had dropped out before finishing the 10th grade.

--Approximately half of the subjects said that most or all of their friend were employed full-time, while 23 percent said that only a few or none of their friends were employed full-time.

--Thirty-five percent of the subjects said that they were doing a "little better" or "much better" than their friends, while 12 percent said that they were not doing "as well".

--Twenty-one percent said that their families had expected "a great deal" or "too much" from them, while 19 percent said that their families had expected "not very much" or "not enough".

--Sixty-one percent said their families were usually or always fair, while 4 percent said that their families were usually or always unfair.

--Fifty percent of the subjects said that their families always or usually paid attention to what they wanted, while 12 percent said they seldom or never paid attention to what they wanted.

--Sixty-six percent said that their families were "very interested" in them while 3 percent said that they were "not interested at all."

--Thirteen percent said that their families were "rather easy" or "too easy."

--Five percent said their families were in favor of their dropping out of school, while 81 percent said their families were opposed.

Activities After Leaving School

Since this study sought subjects who had not enrolled in Federal Manpower Programs, the names of subjects who were eligible for this study in terms of sex, race, age, and dropout status were checked against Federal Manpower Program records in each site, and those with records of enrollment were deleted from the study groups. Because of the incompleteness of the records, however, the participation of some subjects was not determined until time of interview.

--Manpower Program participation was determined for 79 subjects prior to interview and for an additional 50 subjects by means of the interview, making a total of 20 percent of the initial sample of 665 subjects. Of these, 11 percent enrolled in Job Corps; 6 percent, in the Out-of-School NYC program; 2 percent, in MDTA; and 1 percent, in two or more programs.

--Current activities were determined for 445 subjects. Of this group, 27 percent were in the military service; 8 percent, in jail; 3 percent, in school or training programs; 38 percent were employed full- or part-time; and 17 percent were unemployed.

--Among the 309 interviewed subjects, 80 percent were in the civilian labor market. Twenty-three percent of these were unemployed and looking for work.

--Interviewed subjects averaged 2.7 jobs since dropping out of school.

--The first job after leaving school was most likely to be in food preparation or service, custodial, or unskilled labor; and the average hourly pay was $1.84.

--The most recent job averaged $2.19 per hour and differed from the first job in that less subjects were employed in food preparation and service and more, in factory work. The current job was also given a higher rating on a Like-Work scale.

--Eighty-six percent of the subjects no longer held their first jobs. Fifty-four percent said they left because they "quit", while 17 percent left because the job ended. Nine percent said that they were fired. Approximately the same distribution of reasons was given for leaving the most recent job.

--In response to the question, "What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?", subjects tended to concentrate their responses in two occupational categories: entrepreneur or professional; and skilled manual trades and crafts, and technicians.

--When occupational goal information was being coded, the coders reviewed the descriptions of the subjects' current or most recent jobs and evaluated the goal in relation to the jobs they had held. More than three-fourths of the current jobs were unrelated to the subjects' occupational goals.

--Thirty percent of the subjects thought that their chances of achieving their ten-year occupational goals were "very good" and 27 percent thought that they were "not so good" or "unlikely".

--Fifty-one percent of the subjects said there was nothing holding them back from achieving their occupational goals, while 38 percent listed lack of education or training. Only one percent gave discrimination as a deterrent.

--The average lowest acceptable rate of pay when they were looking for jobs was $2.01 per hour.

Knowledge and Attitudes Concerning State Employment Service and Federal Manpower Programs

--Eighty-seven percent reported that they had heard of their State Employment Service. Sixty-nine percent knew where to register, and 38 percent had actually registered. Of those who had registered, 35 percent had been referred to an employer and had gotten a job.

--The most frequent positive impressions about the State Employment Service were related to referral effectiveness. The negative impressions related to slowness of service and the quality of jobs.

--Seventy-six percent of the subjects had heard of the Youth Opportunity Center. Fifty-four percent knew where to register, and 39 percent had actually registered. Of those who had registered, 53 percent had been referred to employers and had gotten jobs.

--The most frequent positive impressions of the Youth Opportunity Center related to referral effectiveness and youth specialization. The negative impressions related to quality of jobs and the slowness of service.

--Only 3 percent of the subjects had heard of the New Careers program, and none had enrolled.

--Only about 26 percent of the subjects had heard of the Out-of-School NYC program or MDTA programs, and less than a third of these knew "quite

a bit about" them. Lack of information, thus, was the major barrier to participation in these programs.

--The most frequent positive impressions about the Out-of-School NYC program related to career and personal development, and jobs. The negative impressions related to pay.

--The most frequent positive impressions of MDTA related to vocational training; and the negative impressions, to pay.

Ninety-six percent of the subjects had heard of the Job Corps but only 22 percent had thought about applying.

--The most frequent positive impressions of the Job Corps related to career value and vocational opportunity. The negative impressions related to getting and being away from home, and the characteristics of the Job Corps camps.

Variables Associated with Quality of Employment Outcomes

On the basis of their activities since leaving school, interviewed subjects were sorted into six ranked categories of employment adjustment. Socio-economic family characteristics did not consistently differentiate among ranked categories of employment adjustment. The group showing the best employment adjustment tended to come from families with higher annual income; on the other hand, the principal adult was less likely to be working at time of dropou Very significantly more of the subjects in the "good" categories as compared

with subjects in the "poor" categories:

--Completed ten or more school grades.

--Had more positive attitudes towards school.

--Were older at time of school dropout.

--Were more likely to be married and living with their wives.

--Were more likely to say that their families were "usually" or "always" fair in dealing with them.

--Were more likely to say that their families "usually" or "always" paid attention to their wishes in decisions concerning them.

--Disagreed that most work is dull and boring.

--Were more likely to say that their chances of having a happy home life in the future are good.

--Were more likely to say that so far in their lives they have been very lucky.

--Were more likely to say that they had a lot of confidence in themselves.

--Were less likely to say that most of their teachers had it in for them and gave them a hard time.

Conclusions

1. At the time of interview, approximately 2½ years, on the average, after study subjects had dropped out of school, various indicators showed that they still were in need of extensive employability assistance.

2. A large proportion of the dropout population in the two cities qualified for Manpower Programs under poverty guidelines. However, subjects who did not meet the poverty guidelines appeared to have as great a need for enhanced employability as those who did.

3. Unawareness of the NYC and the MDTA programs could account for most of the non-participation in these programs by subjects with salient employability needs.

4. The following conclusions were reached regarding the nature of the needs for employability assistance:

a. Unemployment did not result primarily from lack of available jobs.

b. Job turnover resulted primarily from a lack of fit between the subject and the job.

c. There was a wide discrepancy between the ten-year occupational goals and the current jobs held by the subjects.

d. Employability needs did not decrease as age increased among the age ranges included in this study.

e. Lack of education or training was reported as the principal barrier to occupational goal achievement.

Program Implications

1. Study results suggest that the employability assistance needed by Negro male high school dropouts in center cities in large metropolitan areas

are general, continue past the age of 20, and are not limited to those qualifying under poverty guidelines.

2. The apparent success of the widespread use of the media announcements of the Job Corps suggests that this means of reaching youth in need of the services of Manpower Programs might increase the awareness of other programs, such as NYC and MDTA programs. Improvement in counseling by schools, State Employment Serivces, and Youth Opportunity Centers also is clearly needed if this client population is to be reached.

3. It was suggested that human performance is a complex of three sequential skills: Adaptive, Functional, and Specific Content skills. Adaptive skills refer to those competencies that enable an individual to accept and adjust to the physical, interpersonal, and organizational arrangements and conditions in which a job exists. Adaptive skills appeared to be a precondition of acquiring Functional skills and Specific Content skills. The concentration in classroom or on-the-job training programs has been on Functional skills or Specific Content skills, ignoring, for the most part, the Adaptive skills. Numerous Government training programs, designed to train the disadvantaged, somehow have not achieved their objective of on-the-job success for the trainees although the trainees appeared to acquire Functional skills during this training. What probably happened was that they lacked "management of self" skills which continuously blocked their acquisition of on-the-job skills that would enable them to use their functional potential to the best advantage.

4. The development of Adaptive skills of out-of-school youth can probably be achieved better on the job than through a classroom approach, and it is likely to be a slow, difficult process in which the youth needs to learn from his mistakes and be rewarded for his successes. Training and employment opportunities need to be kept available, but it should be recognized that the youth may not be able to take advantage of these opportunities at any particular time; he may need to make some mistakes before he is motivated to apply himself. Failure in one program should not exclude him from another. Seriously disadvantaged youth often need a number of chances--if a single opportunity were enough, most of them could succeed without special assistance. Manpower Programs should help the youth test reality and temporarily terminate him if he fails to meet reasonable performance standards. Opportunities should be kept open to him and he should be made aware of these opportunities and encouraged to use them.

5. While the development of Adaptive and Functional skills appears to be a crucial element in an effective Manpower Program, the nature of the job opportunity structure cannot be ignored. Efforts should be made to expand the range of jobs which can be realistically considered by Negro male school dropouts and to eliminate dead-end jobs through redesigning jobs and upgrading the skills of those already employed.

CONTENTS

		Page
	Highlights	i
	Contents	xiii
	List of Tables	xvi
I	Introduction and Rationale	1
	Scope of Study	1
	Study Objectives	2
	Rationale and Research Questions	2
	Plan of Presentation	3
II	The Study Sites	4
	Selection	4
	Work Force Characteristics	6
	Manpower Programs	9
	Job Corps	10
	Job Corps Skills Center	10
	Manpower Development Training Programs	11
	Neighborhood Youth Corps	11
	In-School NYC	11
	Out-of-School NYC	12
	New Careers	12
III	Sample Selection and Interviewing	13
	Sample Selection	13
	Participation in Federal Manpower Programs	15
	Mailing Address Check	16
	Interviewing	16
	Results	17
	Interviewing Outcomes and Age	19
	Interviewing Outcomes and Highest School Grade Completed (School Records)	19
	Enrollment in Manpower Programs	21
IV	Characteristics of Interviewed Subjects	23
	Mobility	23
	Family Backgrounds	28
	Financial Eligibility	36
	Dropout	39
	Reasons for Leaving School	44

. . .

CONTENTS, Con't.

		Page
IV	Characteristics of Interviewed Subjects, Con't.	
	Liking for School	49
	Ability in Reading and Math	53
	Vocational Usefulness of Schooling	55
	Schooling After Dropout	57
	Vocational Courses After Leaving School	60
	Military Service	61
	Family Circumstances at Time of Interview	64
	Ways of Looking for Jobs	71
	Attitudes Toward Self, Work, and Life	73
	Comparisons with Friends	73
	Family Attitudes	76
	Summary	84
V	Activities after Leaving School	85
	Activities at Time of Interview	85
	Activities in the 18-Month Period, January, 1968, through June, 1969	90
	Employment after Dropout	93
	Occupational Goals	105
	Lowest Acceptable Salary	109
	Summary	111
VI	Knowledge and Attitudes Concerning State Employment Service and Federal Manpower Programs	112
	State Employment Service	113
	Youth Opportunity Center	121
	Summary, SES and YOC	127
	Federal Manpower Programs	127
	Sources of Information Concerning Federal Manpower Programs	134
	Impressions of the In-School NYC	136
	Impressions of the Out-of-School NYC	138
	Impressions of the Job Corps	140
	Impressions of the MDTA	142
	Summary	144

CONTENTS, Con't.

		Page
VII	Variables Associated with Quality of Employment Outcomes	146
	Categories of Employment Adjustment	146
	Family Backgrounds and Employment Adjustment	151
	School Experience and Employment Adjustment	153
	Characteristics at Time of Interview	156
	Manpower Program Information and Employment Adjustment	153
	Public Employment Agencies and Employment Adjustment	162
	Attitudes and Employment Adjustment	167
	Summary	172
VIII	Improving the Reach of Federal Manpower Programs	173
	Extent of Need	173
	Eligibility for Federal Manpower Programs	174
	Reach of Manpower Programs	176
	The Nature of Need	178
	The Need for Employability Assistance is not Restricted to Unemployed Youths Looking for Work	179
	Unemployment did not Result Primarily from Lack of Job Opportunities	180
	Job Turnover Resulted Primarily from Non-Economic Causes	180
	There was a Wide Discrepancy Between Occupational Goals and Current Job	182
	Need did not Decrease with Age in the Age Ranges Included in this Study	183
	Lack of Education or Training Reported as Principal Barrier to Occupational Goal Achievement	186
	Program Implications	186
Appendices		193
	Appendix A: Interview Schedule	193
	Appendix B: Manpower Services and Programs	227
	Appendix C: Marginals	238

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	SELECTED SCHOOL SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS	5
2	SELECTED 1960 VARIABLES, STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA AND CITY, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS	7
3	SELECTED WORK FORCE VARIABLES, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS AREAS	8
4	NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN SEPTEMBER, 1969, BY CATEGORY, IN BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS AREAS	9
5	SELECTED INTERVIEWER CHARACTERISTICS	18
6	INTERVIEWING RESULTS	18
7	INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES AND AVERAGE AGE AS OF JULY 1, 1969	20
8	INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES AND HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED, SCHOOL RECORDS	20
9	INTERVIEWER'S REPORT OF RESPONDENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERVIEW	22
10	STATE OF BIRTH	24
11	YEARS IN THE CITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	24
12	NUMBER OF RESIDENCES IN SITE CITY	26
13	USUAL MEANS OF MOBILITY WITHIN THE CITY	26
14	FREQUENCY OF LONGEST DISTANCE TRAVEL	27
15	LONGEST DISTANCE (ONE-WAY) TRAVELED FROM HOME MONTH BEFORE INTERVIEW	28
16	FAMILY UNIT TO TIME OF DROPOUT	29
17	HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED BY PRINCIPAL ADULT	30
18	OCCUPATION OF PRINCIPAL ADULT	32
19	ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME IN THE YEAR BEFORE DROPOUT	33
20	NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF DROPOUT	34

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
21	NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED AND CONTRIBUTING TO FAMILY INCOME, TIME OF DROPOUT	34
22	WELFARE RECEIPT PRIOR TO DROPOUT	35
23	SELECTED VARIABLES, PRE-DROPOUT PERIOD	36
24	ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME IN THE YEAR BEFORE DROPOUT, NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD, AND ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	37
25	OCCUPATION OF PRINCIPAL ADULT BY SUBJECTS' ENROLLMENT IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	39
26	SUBJECT AND SCHOOL REPORTS OF DROPOUT MONTH	41
27	MEAN MONTHS SINCE DROPOUT (AS OF JULY 1, 1969) AND MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE OF INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS	42
28	HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS COMPARISONS OF SUBJECT AND SCHOOL INFORMATION, BY SITE	43
29	MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING SCHOOL	45
30	ALL REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL	47
31	REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, SCHOOL RECORDS	48
32	LIKE-SCHOOL RATING	50
33	REASONS FOR LIKE-SCHOOL RATING	51
34	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF READING AND MATH ABILITY	54
35	READING AND MATH ABILITY COMPARISONS, ENROLLEES AND NON-ENROLLEES	55
36	USEFULNESS OF SCHOOLING AS VOCATIONAL PREPARATION	56
37	RETURN TO FULL TIME SCHOOL AFTER DROPOUT	58
38	ENROLLMENT IN SPECIAL CLASSES AFTER DROPOUT	59
39	VOCATIONAL COURSES AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL	60

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
40	INTERVIEW STATUS AND MILITARY SERVICE	62
41	MILITARY SERVICE AND SELECTIVE SERVICE CLASSIFICATION	63
42	MARITAL STATUS, AND WHEN MARRIED (MONTHS BEFORE JULY 1, 1969)	64
43	CHILDREN AND NUMBER LIVING WITH SUBJECT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	65
44	FAMILY UNIT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	67
45	MAJOR SOURCE OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	68
46	ALL SOURCES OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	69
47	SELECTED VARIABLES, ALL SUBJECTS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW	70
48	WAYS OF LOOKING FOR A JOB	72
49	SCHOOLING OF MOST OF SUBJECT'S FRIENDS	75
50	EXTENT OF FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG SUBJECT'S FRIENDS	75
51	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF HIS SUCCESS COMPARED TO FRIENDS	76
52	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY EXPECTATIONS OF HIM	79
53	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY FAIRNESS TO HIM	80
54	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN FAMILY DECISIONS CONCERNING HIM	80
55	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY INTEREST IN HIM	81
56	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY STRICTNESS WITH HIM	81
57	SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY ATTITUDE TO HIS DROPOUT	82
58	ATTITUDES TOWARD SELF, WORK, AND LIFE, MEAN RATINGS	83
59	ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, INTERVIEWED (I), AND UNINTERVIEWED (U) SUBJECTS	86
60	INDEX OF CRIME, 1968, IN BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS	87
61	ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SUBJECTS WHO HAD NEVER AND SUBJECTS WHO HAD EVER ENROLLED IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	88

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
62	CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE STATUS, TIME OF INTERVIEW, JANUARY 1, 1968, AND JANUARY 1, 1969	89
63	MEAN MONTHS IN ALL ACTIVITIES, 18-MONTH PERIOD (JANUARY, 1968 - JUNE, 1969)	91
64	FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT, 18-MONTH PERIOD, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS CONTINUOUSLY IN CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE AND NEVER ENROLLED IN ANY OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAM	92
65	NUMBER OF JOBS SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL	93
66	WHEN FIRST JOB BEGAN	94
67	THE FIRST JOB, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	96
68	REASONS FOR LIKE-WORK RATING	97
69	HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT FIRST JOB	99
70	MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE FIRST JOB	100
71	CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	101
72	REASONS FOR LIKE-WORK RATING, CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB	102
73	HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB	103
74	MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE MOST RECENT JOB	104
75	WHAT KIND OF WORK WOULD YOU REALLY LIKE TO BE DOING 10 YEARS FROM NOW?	105
76	CODER'S COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB	106
77	SUBJECTS' ESTIMATE OF CHANCES OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	107
78	IS THERE ANYTHING THAT MIGHT HOLD YOU BACK FROM ACHIEVING OCCUPATIONAL GOAL?	108
79	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, OCCUPATIONAL GOALS BY ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	109
80	LOWEST ACCEPTABLE RATE OF PAY	110

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
81	SELECTED VARIABLES, STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE	114
82	STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACTIONS, ALL SUBJECTS REGISTERED IN STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE	115
83	IMPRESSIONS OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, PART 1, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF SES	117
84	SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT SES, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF SES	118
85	IMPRESSIONS OF THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, PART 2, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF SES	120
86	SELECTED VARIABLES, YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTER	121
87	YOC ACTIONS, ALL SUBJECTS REGISTERED IN YOC	122
88	SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT YOC, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC	123
89	IMPRESSIONS OF YOC, PART 1, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC	124
90	IMPRESSIONS OF YOC, PART 2, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC	126
91	PARTICIPATION OF TOTAL SAMPLE IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE	129
92	SUBJECT'S RECOGNITION OF AND INTEREST IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE AND PROGRAM	131
93	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, EXPERIENCE IN AND KNOWLEDGE OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE AND PROGRAM -- ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF PROGRAMS	132
94	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, PROGRAM EXPERIENCE, ALL SUBJECTS ENROLLED BY SITE AND PROGRAM	133
95	HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE AND PROGRAMS	135
96	IMPRESSIONS OF THE IN-SCHOOL NYC, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF PROGRAM, BY SITE	137

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
97	IMPRESSIONS OF THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF PROGRAM, BY SITE	139
98	IMPRESSIONS OF THE JOB CORPS, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF THE PROGRAM, BY SITE	141
99	IMPRESSIONS OF THE MDTA, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF THE PROGRAM, BY SITE	143
100	INFORMATION RELATING TO OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC, JOB CORPS, AND MDTA, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BY ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	145
101	EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENTS BY SITE AND ENROLLMENT IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS	149
102	CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT, ENROLLMENT IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS, AND SITE	150
103	SELECTED SOCIO-ECONOMIC FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	152
104	SELECTED SCHOOL EXPERIENCE CHARACTERISTICS AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	155
105	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	157
106	FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAM INFORMATION AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	161
107	UTILIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTER, AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	164
108	USUAL WAYS OF LOOKING FOR JOBS AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	166
109	SUBJECTS' COMPARISONS OF SELF WITH REPORT OF "MOST YOUNG MEN WHO ARE YOUR FRIENDS" AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	163
110	SUBJECTS' REPORTS OF FAMILY ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES UP TO TIME OF DROPOUT, AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	169
111	SIGNIFICANT ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COMBINED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT	171

LIST OF TABLES, CON'T.

Table		Page
112	PROPORTION OF INTERVIEWED SAMPLE MAKING A POOR OCCUPATIONAL ADJUSTMENT USING VARIOUS ADJUSTMENT CRITERIA	174
113	COMPARISON OF AVERAGE PAY ON MOST RECENT JOB WITH AVERAGE LOWEST ACCEPTABLE PAY BY RANKED ADJUSTMENT CATEGORIES	181
114	COMPARISON OF 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB . .	183
115	COMPARISON OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF 1/1/68 AND DATE OF INTERVIEW BY DATE OF BIRTH, ALL INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS NOT IN SCHOOL, TRAINING PROGRAMS, OR MILITARY SERVICE	185

Introduction and Rationale

This is a report of research undertaken to investigate those characteristics of Negro male high school dropouts that might inhibit their participation in Federal Manpower Programs. This study developed from an earlier study of the Neighborhood Youth Corps--one of the major programs designed to help such young men in their adjustments to the world of work. The results of the earlier research indicated, in part, that the NYC might be failing to reach "hard core" dropout youths.[1] The present study generalized the question of the specific reach of the NYC to the reach of all programs especially relevant to young dropouts. Instead of focussing on the characteristics of program participants, as in the earlier study, the present study sought subjects who had not enrolled in Federal Manpower Programs.

Scope of Study

Study groups composed of approximately 300 young men, born before 1952 and who left school in 1966-67 before graduating from high school, were constituted in Baltimore and St. Louis. These young men were interviewed in the summer of 1969.[2]

[1]See, The Social Research Group of The George Washington University (Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator), "A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs--Implications for Program Operations and Research" (1969), p. 5.

[2]See Appendix A for a copy of the interview schedule.

Interview information was secured for 58 percent of all subjects; and activity at the time of interview was ascertained for an additional 25 percent of all subjects. In the latter category were many young men, currently serving in the Armed Forces, whose activity was reported to interviewers by family or friends.

Study Objectives

The primary objective of the study was to discover causative factors in non-participation--the characteristics of study subjects, including their perceptions of Manpower Programs, that might inhibit their participation in such programs. It was anticipated that alternative activities--for example, civilian employment or service in the Armed Forces--would be important factors in non-participation; and a secondary objective of the study was to gain a better understanding of post-dropout activities. Finally, on the basis of study results, it was hoped that realistic recommendations could be developed to the end that the potential of Federal Manpower Programs to be of service to Negro male high school dropouts could be more fully realized.

Rationale and Research Questions

In general, the theoretical approach to the study included the following assumptions: (1) the quality of a young man's adjustment to the world of work depends primarily on the adequacy of his preparations for employment; (2) schooling and/or vocational training are the principal preparatory experiences; (3) useful preparatory experiences are a matter not only of specific academic and/or vocational skills but also of developed attitudes that will permit productive participation in the world of work. The basic research question of the study was the degree

to which study subjects were not being reached by Manpower Programs; that is, judged on the basis of the quality of employment adjustments of such subjects, what was the extent of the need for services that could be supplied by Manpower Programs? Subsidiary questions included (1) investigation of the role of attitudinal characteristics, not only in adjustments to the world of work but in preparations for employment, including participation in Manpower Programs; and (2) perceptions of self and of Manpower Programs which are important determinants of the reach of such programs.

Plan of Presentation

The following two chapters of this report describe in greater detail the study design and interviewing outcomes. Chapter IV reports the characteristics of study subjects with the exception of employment characteristics, which are reported in Chapter V, and perceptions of manpower services and programs which are reported in Chapter VI. Chapter VII provides an analysis of the issues--the needs for services that could be provided by manpower programs and the characteristics of dropout youth, including their perceptions of the programs, that might interfere with their participation. Recommendations, developed from the analysis of issues, that might improve the reach of the Federal Manpower Programs conclude the report.

II

The Study Sites

Selection

Site selection criteria related primarily to the feasibility of constituting study groups of approximately 300 Negro male high school dropouts on the basis of public school records. These criteria included such site and school system characteristics as the proportion of Negroes in the city's population, the size of public school enrollment, the dropout rate, the suitability of school record systems to sampling procedures, and the willingness of school officials to provide access to school records. In addition to these technical criteria, final selection required the approval of the city by the Manpower Administrator as a research site. After considering several other sites, Baltimore, Maryland, and St. Louis, Missouri, were selected as study sites and approved by the Department of Labor.

In 1960, Baltimore was the sixth largest city in the United States and was 35 percent nonwhite, while St. Louis ranked tenth and was 29 percent nonwhite. Although the size and social characteristics of 1967 dropout population in Baltimore and St. Louis were unknown, the capacity of these two sites to provide adequate samples could be inferred from available information (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

SELECTED SCHOOL SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS

Characteristics	Baltimore	St. Louis
Public school enrollment, October, 1969[a]	193,082	113,391
Percent of 10th grade entrants not graduating (1962)	35.0	24.7
Grade organization	6-3-3	8-4
Compulsory attendance ages	7-16	6-16
Vocational high schools[b]	yes	no

[a]Source of enrollment statistics: Statistical Division of the National Education Association.

Source of other information: Daniel Schreiber, Holding Power/Large City School Systems (Washington, D.C. : National Education Association, Project on School Dropouts, 1964) pp. 61, 56, 63, 66, 59, resp.

[b]Since 1955, St. Louis has had a combined academic and vocational high school (O'Fallon), which became a "Co-Op" program in 1967. This program operated with ½ of each day in vocational courses at O'Fallon and ½ of each day in academic courses at other schools. A "work-experience" school was opened in February, 1970.

The public school systems in both sites provided free kindergarten classes and free textbooks in both elementary and secondary schools. In other respects, however, the two systems differed. Baltimore, like most large cities, used a 6-3-3 system (3-year junior and senior high schools), while St. Louis

had 4-year secondary schools. Baltimore's compulsory school attendance age span was one year shorter (7-16) than that of St. Louis (6-16), and Baltimore had vocational high schools.

In Baltimore, annual lists of student enrollments were centrally available in an IBM printout that provided the name, address, school and grade, date of birth, race, and sex of each student enrolled in the system as of October 31st. Through the comparison of successive annual printouts it was thus possible to infer whether a student might have dropped out. Actual records of student withdrawal were maintained in the schools last attended, however, so that both the central and the individual school records in Baltimore had to be consulted in order to identify school dropouts.

In St. Louis, weekly withdrawal information was centrally available but withdrawal reports did not include information concerning the student's race. In order to identify Negro dropouts in St. Louis, therefore, it was necessary to consult records in the school of last attendance.

Work Force Characteristics

Since the early 1800's, when Baltimore and St. Louis were the terminal cities of the National Road, the two site cities have been transportation centers attracting industry and commerce. Baltimore, located on the deep-water Patapsco River estuary of the Chesapeake Bay, is an important seaport, and the largest steel plant in the world--Bethlehem Steel's Sparrow Point complex--is located in Baltimore County. In addition to shipping and steel, Baltimore's principal industries include sugar and food processing, petroleum, chemicals,

gypsum products, aircraft and guided missiles. St. Louis, the largest city in the Mississippi-Missouri River Valley, is a rail center second only to Chicago, as well as a manufacturing and banking center. It is the only area in the United States that produces six basic metals--iron, lead, zinc, copper, aluminum, and magnesium.

In 1960, the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas containing Baltimore and St. Louis ranked 12th and 9th in size, respectively, in the United States (see Table 2). Compared to their metropolitan area, residents in both cities were more apt to be nonwhite, impoverished, less educated, and unemployed. The descriptions of area work forces which follow, therefore, may tend to optimize the employment characteristics of the two site cities.

TABLE 2

SELECTED 1960 VARIABLES, STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA AND CITY, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS

1960 Variables	Baltimore		St. Louis	
	SMSA	CITY	SMSA	CITY
U.S. rank	12	6	9	10
Population (thousands)	1,727	939	2,060	750
Annual family income under $3,000 (percent)	14.5	18.6	15.1	21.7
Median years of school completed	9.6	8.9	9.6	8.8
Percent nonwhite	22.2	35.0	14.5	28.8
Civilian labor force (thousands)	679.5	387.3	799.0	310.9
Percent unemployed	5.3	6.5	4.4	5.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. County and City Data Book, 1962 Table 3, pp. 432-455 (SMSA) and Table 6, pp. 516-535 (city).

During the 60's the work forces in both site areas increased, with Baltimore growing more than St. Louis (see Table 3). Compared to November, 1965, November, 1969, unemployment was down in Baltimore but slightly up in St. Louis. In both site areas, the representation of various kinds of jobs in the September, 1969, non-agricultural work force was about the same (see Table 4), although, in St. Louis, slightly more of the jobs were in manufacturing and, in Baltimore, slightly more, were in government.[1] These area work force statistics indicated that employment opportunities were approximately the same in the two sites.

TABLE 3

SELECTED WORK FORCE VARIABLES, BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS AREAS

Variables	Baltimore	St. Louis
Work Force, November, 1965 (thousands)[a]	779.6	959.7
Percent unemployed, November, 1965	3.9	3.2
Work Force, November, 1969 (thousands)[b]	907.6	1,029.3
Percent unemployed, November, 1969	2.5	3.5
Average hourly earnings, manufacturing production employees, September, 1969[c]	$3.40	$3.65

[a]U.S. Department of Labor, Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment, January, 1967, p.45.

[b]U.S. Department of Labor, Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment, January, 1970, p.20. (November, 1969, figures are preliminary).

[c]U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, December, 1969, p. 120.

[1]Federal employment in the Maryland sector of the Washington SMSA, however, was reported in the District of Columbia SMSA. See U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Vol. 16, No. 6 (December, 1969), Table B-7, footnote 4, p.98.

TABLE 4

NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN SEPTEMBER, 1969, BY CATEGORY, IN BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS AREAS

Employment Categories	Baltimore		St. Louis	
	Number (thousands)	Percent	Number (thousands)	Percent
Mining	.3	0	2.3	0
Contract construction	46.9	6	46.4	5
Manufacturing	209.0	26	291.6	32
Transportation, public utilities	57.6	7	69.2	8
Wholesale and retail trade	168.4	21	185.5	21
Finance, insurance, real estate	43.4	5	46.7	5
Services	133.1	16	149.4	16
Government	149.1	19	117.3	13
TOTAL	807.8	100	908.4	100

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Vol. 16, No. 6 (December, 1969), Table B-7, pp.90-99.

Manpower Programs

In Baltimore a number of Outreach Centers, and in St. Louis, a number of Neighborhood Action Centers, provided extensive access to the public employment opportunity structure.[1] The State Employment Service and the Youth Opportunity Center were staffed in the Baltimore Outreach Centers, as well as in several ES offices and one YOC office. In St. Louis, youths were referred

[1]See Appendix B for a more detailed description of services and programs.

by the Neighborhood Action Center staffs to several ES offices or to one of two YOC offices. In both sites, the ES served anyone over the age of 16 who was in need of work or training, and the YOC specialized in youths in the 16-21 age bracket. Both services offered job and training program referrals, testing, and counseling. In Baltimore, the ES used follow-up community workers, and the YOC held sessions to acquaint young persons with jobs in industry.

Job Corps

Eligibility requirements for the Job Corps included age (16-21), family financial status (low income), willingness to leave home and live in an urban or rural Job Corps Center, and family permission to enroll. In addition, Corpsmen could not have 1A draft status or "too extensive" a criminal record.

The Job Corps offered vocational training, basic education, and social and attitudinal enrichment. Corpsmen received an allowance of $30 a month, $50 of which was banked and given to the Corpsman when he left the Corps. In addition, Corpsmen sometimes received special allowances including incentive payments that could raise his monthly "expense" money to $50.

Job Corps Skills Center

In Baltimore, there was, since June, 1968, a Job Corps Skill Center that provided training in the culinary arts, manufacturing orientation, and knowledge of plant operations. Enrollment in the Center was open to Maryland residents, with out-of-city enrollees living at the Center and Baltimore enrollees living at home. Otherwise, eligibility and participation conditions were the same as those of the regular Job Corps.

Manpower Development Training Programs

The programs offered vocational training and, when needed, basic and remedial education, to unemployed and under-employed persons over the age of 16. The programs provided training allowances.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

The NYC involved two programs--In-School, designed primarily to help students stay in school, and Out-of-School, designed primarily to provide work training and educational remediation to school dropouts. Both programs had been in operation in both sites since December, 1966.

In-School NYC

In addition to the remunerated work experience commonly provided by In-School NYC programs, Baltimore In-School NYCers received dental and health care and were involved in a number of experiences designed to enhance their career potentials--visits to colleges, places of interest, and places offering career opportunities, secretarial workshops, and job placements for graduates.

In December, 1966, the hourly NYC rate of pay was $1.25 an hour in both sites. Since then, the rate increased in both sites, rising to $1.40 an hour by 1969 in Baltimore, and to $1.60 an hour by 1969 in St. Louis. The December 1966 In-School enrollment was about the same in both sites (566 in Baltimore, and 551 in St. Louis); and, in both sites, male enrollees were considerably outnumbered by female enrollees (229 to 337 in Baltimore, and 203 to 348, in St. Louis).

The In-School NYC program tied in the NYC Summer program which provided remunerated work experience to students during the summer months.

Out-of-School NYC

Eligibility for enrollment in the Out-of-School NYC included age (16-21), financial status (member of a low-income family), and school status (out of school at least three months in the regular school year and not planning to return to school). In addition, in Baltimore, the enrollee had to be a resident of the city.

In December, 1966, the Baltimore program was somewhat larger than that of St. Louis (1,345 and 982, respectively) with females outnumbering males in both sites. The June, 1969, enrollments in both sites were considerably smaller than the 1966 enrollments; and, in both sites, the proportion of males had very markedly decreased. In Baltimore, the 1969 enrollment was 809 and the proportion of males had decreased from 37 percent to 15 percent. In St. Louis, the 1969 enrollment was 440 and the proportion of males had decreased from 46 percent to 18 percent.

New Careers

New Careers was the most recent addition to the opportunity structure, dating from August 1967 in St. Louis and from October, 1967, in Baltimore. In both sites, the program was targeted on persons over the age of 22 and in poverty. In Baltimore, eligibility might include a functional 8th grade level of education; and, in St. Louis, eligibility included the possession of a high school diploma or the potential to acquire one within six months after enrollment.

New Careers provided work training and educational preparation designed to qualify trainees for non-professional jobs in health and social service. Trainees received training allowances ($1.60 an hour) and weekly travel allowances where warranted.

III

Sample Selection and Interviewing

The study population was specified to consist of Negro male dropouts, born before 1952, who had left urban public schools in a 12-month period in 1966-67, and who had not subsequently enrolled in any Federal Manpower programs.[1] Two samples of this population were constituted--one in Baltimore, and one in St. Louis--and subjects in the samples were interviewed in the summer of 1969. This chapter describes these two phases of the study.

Sample Selection

The two study samples were selected on the basis of school and manpower program records. The different school system records in the two site cities, however, entailed different selection procedures.

In Baltimore, annual public school enrollments as of October 31st, alphabetically listing all students in the system, were centrally available in 3,7000-page IBM printouts. The date of these printouts defined the 12-month dropout period in Baltimore--November 1, 1966, through October 31, 1967. A preliminary comparison of 1966 and 1967 Baltimore enrollments indicated that, on the average, about one name per 1966 page would be that of a Negro male, born before 1952, who dropped out of school before October 31, 1967. A table of random numbers was used to select 947 pages from the 1966 enrollments. Each of these pages was scanned for Negro males, born before 1952, and the names of students so identified were checked against the 1967 enrollments.

[1] For the purposes of this study, only the out-of-school programs--the Out-of-School NYC, the Job Corps, MDTA, and New Careers--were considered as the bases of non-eligibility.

All who were not enrolled in 1967 were then checked out through their local school records to see whether they qualified for the dropout study.

Local school records permitted the identification of a number of ineligible subjects--students who left school because of graduation, transfer, institutionalization, or certified inability to profit from further schooling, as well as some students who had not, in fact, dropped out of school. Some 454 students remained eligible for the study after local school records had been examined; and, for each of these, local records were used to furnish the date of permanent withdrawal from school, reason for withdrawal, and the names and addresses of parents or guardians. A sample of 300 names was randomly selected from the eligible subjects. The 154 "extra" names were ordered as randomly selected to be used as replacements for subjects that might be deleted because they had participated in Federal manpower programs.

In St. Louis centrally-available records of student withdrawals did not indicate the student's race and, furthermore, St. Louis records did not reflect dropouts prior to 9th grade.[1] All withdrawals during the 12-month period, October 1, 1966-September 30, 1967, were listed by school; and the lists were then submitted to the schools involved so that the names of non-Negroes could be deleted. After non-dropout withdrawals (transfer, institutionalization, and the like) and ineligible subjects (born after 1952, or non-Negro) had been

[1]The reason given by school officials for not reporting dropouts before the 9th grade was that extensive efforts were made to keep students in school at least until they entered the 9th grade. It should be noted that students in St. Louis stayed until the 8th grade in schools in which one teacher had responsibility for a class for the entire day, while Baltimore had the junior high school system in which the students had a different teacher for each class starting in the 7th grade.

deleted, an eligible population of 1,182 remained. A study sample of 300 names was drawn from this population by random methods, and an additional 140 names were randomly identified to serve as replacements for subjects determined to be ineligible because of participation in manpower programs. These 440 names were sorted by school of last attendance--eight of St. Louis's twelve high schools were represented--and the names and addresses of parents or guardians were secured from the schools.

Participation in Federal Manpower Programs

The names of subjects who were eligible for the study in terms of sex, race, age, and dropout status were checked against Federal manpower program records, and those with records of enrollment were deleted from the study groups. In Baltimore, approximately 16 percent of the otherwise eligible dropouts were disqualified for the study group because of participation, and Job Corps experience was by far the most frequent experience. In St. Louis, the records of Federal manpower programs--with the exception of the out-of-school NYC--were very fragmentary. Approximately 10 percent of the otherwise eligible St. Louis subjects had been in the out-of-school NYC and were deleted from the study; and, in addition, one subject known to have been in the Job Corps was deleted. Qualified subjects from the replacement study groups were then added to the initial study groups to achieve samples of 300 in each site.

At the time of the Federal manpower program participation check, it became evident that, in all probability, a check of program records would not result in the pre-interview identification of all subjects with manpower program

experience. Not only the apparent disorganization of some of the records but the sharply discrepant participation results in the two sites indicated that some participation might not have been reflected in the record check. It followed that interviewing might show more participation. The decision was taken at this time to continue the interview in such cases, and to consider the participant interviews as a source of information regarding characteristics associated with the reach of manpower programs.

Mailing Address Check

After study samples had been constituted in the two sites, the names and addresses of study subjects (based on school records at the time of dropout) were given to the local post offices with the request that mailing addresses be corrected. Approximately one-fourth of the subjects in the samples in each city had last-known addresses that were no longer valid and which could not be corrected through post-office information.

Interviewing

Field supervisors were designated for each study site; and, within guidelines developed by the research staff, they were given full responsibility for hiring interviewers and organizing their work. All of the interviewers were Negro and male, with the Baltimore staff being larger and the St. Louis staff being more diversified in terms of occupational background (see Table 5). Training sessions were conducted at each site, and interviewing got under way in July, 1969. Interviewing continued for approximately four months.

Results

Through inadvertence, nine subjects in St. Louis were not assigned to interviewers so that the St. Louis sample was reduced to 291. Every effort was made to reach all the other subjects; and interviews were completed for 64 percent of the Baltimore subjects and for 52 percent of the St. Louis subjects (see Table 6). Many of the subjects who could not be reached--subjects in the army or in jail, for example--were nevertheless reflected in information developed by the study when the interviewers were able to find out what the subjects were doing. In all, activity at the time of interview was developed either by interview of subjects or from other informants for 86 percent of the Baltimore subjects and for 76 percent of the St. Louis subjects. An additional 5 percent of the St. Louis subjects were found to be ineligible in the course of attempting to locate them and were not interviewed.

In some cases, interviewing disclosed that school records had not correctly identified study subjects. In most of these cases, the subject stated that he had not dropped out of school; and the interviewer's instructions in this event were to continue the interview. Such cases were then reviewed by the field supervisor who decided whether the subject was, in fact, eligible for the study.

TABLE 5

SELECTED INTERVIEWER CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Baltimore N=19	St. Louis N=11
Usual occupation		
Teacher	63%	45%
Social worker	26	9
Public welfare interviewer	11	0
Other--security guard, police officer, job placement counselor, factory supervisor, recreational therapist	0	45
TOTAL[a]	100%	99%
Mean years of age	31	34
Mean years of school	16	16

[a]In this and in subsequent tables, percentages have been rounded and consequently do not always sum to 100%.

TABLE 6

INTERVIEWING RESULTS

Results	Baltimore N	Baltimore %	St. Louis N	St. Louis %	Total N	Total %
Ineligibility determined prior to interview	0	0%	14	5%	14	2%
Interviewed	191	64	151	52	342	58
Not interviewed but labor force activity ascertained	65	22	71	24	146	25
Not interviewed and activity not ascertained	44	15	55	19	99	17
TOTAL INTERVIEWS ATTEMPTED	300	101%	291	100%	591	102%
Ineligible interviewed subjects (number)	(15)		(18)		(33)	
Usable interviews (number)	(176)		(133)		(309)	

Interviewing Outcomes and Age

The average age of all study subjects, as of July 1, 1969, was 20 years (see Table 7). In both Baltimore and St. Louis, subjects who were not interviewed but whose activity at the time of attempted interview was ascertained by the interviewer were several months older than other subjects. Aside from this very significant[1] difference, study subjects were, on the average, of the same age regardless of site or follow-up results.

Interviewing Outcomes and Highest School Grade Completed (School Records)

School records indicated that Baltimore subjects averaged fewer school grades completed (8.7) than did St. Louis subjects (9.3 grades). This marked difference between sites was apparent in all categories of subjects with the exception of uninterviewed subjects whose activity was ascertained (see Table 8). These results indicated that military service (the principal ascertained activity of non-interviewed subjects) tended to remove older and better-educated dropouts from the interviewed portion of the study sample. The generally higher school achievement of St. Louis subjects may have been largely due to (1) the absence of St. Louis pre-ninth grade withdrawals, and (2) the Baltimore schooling span (7-16, as compared with the St. Louis 6-16).

[1] In this report, "significant" is reserved for descriptions of statistical significance. "Very significant" connotes differences that could be expected to occur by chance 1 time (or less) in 100, while "significant" connotes differences that could be expected to occur more often, but no more frequently than 5 times in 100.

Standard statistical procedures have been used to determine confidence levels. The significance of differences between means has been evaluated through the t-test formula, and the significance of differences between percentages has been evaluated through an adaptation of the t-test formula. This adaptation is described in the monograph:

Vernon Davies, Rapid Method for Determining Significance of Difference Between Two Percentages. Institute of Agricultural Science, Washington State University Stations Circular 151 (revised July, 1962).

TABLE 7

INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES AND AVERAGE AGE
AS OF JULY 1, 1969

Outcomes	Baltimore Number	Baltimore Mean Age	St. Louis Number	St. Louis Mean Age	Total Number	Total Mean Age
		(years)		(years)		(years)
Interviewed	176	20.0	133	19.9	309	19.9
Not Interviewed						
Activity ascertained	65	20.3	71	20.3	136	20.3
Activity not ascertained	44	19.9	54	20.0	98	19.9
Subtotal, not interviewed	109	20.1	125	20.1	234	20.1
TOTAL	285	20.0	258	20.0	543	20.0

TABLE 8

INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES AND HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED,
SCHOOL RECORDS

Outcomes	Baltimore Number	Baltimore Mean Grade	St. Louis Number	St. Louis Mean Grade	Total Number	Total Mean Grade
Interviewed	176	8.5	133	9.2	309	8.8
Not Interviewed						
Activity ascertained	65	9.3	71	9.5	136	9.4
Activity not ascertained	44	8.4	54	9.5	98	8.9
Subtotal, not interviewed	109	8.9	125	9.5	234	9.2
TOTAL	285	8.7	258	9.3	543	9.0

Enrollment in Manpower Programs

Fifty interviewed subjects--31 in Baltimore and 19 in St. Louis--reported that they had at some time enrolled in one or more of the out-of-school Federal Manpower Programs. In many cases, the subject remembered little about when or how long he had been enrolled, or reported limited experience with the programs.[1] Perhaps because their experience was often minimal, the characteristics of subjects who had ever enrolled in Manpower Programs were generally similar to those of dropouts who had never enrolled. Subjects who had ever enrolled, accordingly, have been considered with other subjects, with significant differences between enrollees and non-enrollees being reported as warranted by the data.

Interviewers' Impressions

Most subjects (68 percent) were reported by their interviewer to have been 'friendly, cooperative' during the interview, and one-fourth were reported to have been 'casual, impersonal." Reluctance, suspicion, hostility, or indifference were reported for only 7 percent of the subjects. The attitudes of study subjects toward the interview were substantially the same in both sites and were generally conducive to good interviewing results (see Table 9).

After the interview was completed, the interviewer recorded his impressions of defects apparent in the course of the interview that might impair the subject's ability to work. Most subjects (96 percent) had no apparent disabilities. Defects reported--speech problems, partial blindness,

[1]See Chapter VI for a report of experience with Manpower Programs.

physical impairment and chronic disease--could limit the subject's productive participation in the world of work to a greater or lesser extent; but, in general, such defects were of very minor importance in the study samples.

TABLE 9

INTERVIEWER'S REPORT OF RESPONDENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERVIEW

Attitude	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	percent	percent	percent
Friendly, cooperative	65%	73%	68%
Casual, impersonal	27	21	25
Suspicious, reluctant	5	5	5
Hostile	1	1	1
Totally detached	2	0	1
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(5)	(7)

IV

Characteristics of Interviewed Subjects

The personal and family characteristics of study subjects, discussed in this chapter, were reported to interviewers in the summer and fall of 1969. In some instances--for example, years in the city--the information covered the life-span of the dropout up to the time of interview; while, in other instances--for example, sources of support--the information was current as of the date of interview. The variables involved have been treated in the approximate order of their earliest reach, with the information reaching to the subject's earliest years being discussed first.

Mobility

Most of the study subjects were born in the site States--84 percent of the Baltimore subjects were born in Maryland, and 74 percent of the St. Louis subjects, in Missouri (see Table 10). Considering also adjacent States--often closer to the site cities than outlying portions of the site States--91 percent of the Baltimore subjects, and 84 percent of the St. Louis subjects were living in or close to their birth States at the time of interview. Extensive interstate migration, so far as movement from birth State was concerned, thus characterized relatively few subjects. It is of interest, however, that almost all of the Baltimore subjects not born in Maryland or adjacent States were born in North or South Carolina; and, among comparable St. Louis subjects, some was born in the Carolinas and most were born in Mississippi.

Most of the subjects in both states had lived in their respective

site cities 16, or more, years (see Table 11). Very significantly more St. Louis subjects, however, migrated to the city in their childhood--23 percent of the St. Louis subjects, as compared with 11 percent of the Baltimore subjects, had lived in their respective cities less than 16 years.

TABLE 10

STATE OF BIRTH

State of Birth	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Site state	84%	74%	80%
Adjacent states	7	10	8
North and South Carolina	9	0	5
Mississippi	0	11	5
Other states	1	5	3
TOTAL	101%	100%	101%

TABLE 11

YEARS IN THE CITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Years	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
5, or less	2%	2%	2%
6-10	4	10	6
11-15	5	11	7
16, or more	90	78	85
TOTAL	101%	101%	100%
Mean Years in the City	18.1	17.2	17.7

Although most of the subjects had spent most of their lives in their respective site cities, very few of them had not moved within the city (see Table 12). On the average, study subjects had lived in about four different places in the city up through the time of interview.

In response to the question, "How do you usually get around the city?" most subjects said that they either walked or used public transportation (see Table 13). Very significantly more Baltimore subjects than St. Louis subjects used public transportation; and very significantly more St. Louis subjects than Baltimore subjects used their own means of transportation. These site differences suggested that the city locations usually traveled to by subjects were more accessible by public transportation in Baltimore than they were in St. Louis. Alternatively, these results suggested that St. Louis subjects were more often able to afford their own means of transportation and preferred them to public transportation.

Subjects were also asked, "Last month, what was the longest distance (one-way) that you traveled from home?" and "About how often do you travel this far from home?" Most of the subjects reported travels that were evidently not connected with routine mobility but were weekly, monthly, or annual trips. The percentages of subjects reporting annual or semi-annual trips that occurred in the month preceding interview was considerably higher than those that would have been expected by chance. These results suggested that the subjects often had a desire to report their most extensive travels (see Table 14).

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF RESIDENCES IN SITE CITY

Number of Residences	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
One	3%	5%	7%
2-5	73	79	76
6-10	18	15	17
11, or more	2	1	1
TOTAL	101%	100%	101%
Mean number of residences	3.9	3.8	3.9
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(2)

TABLE 13

USUAL MEANS OF MOBILITY WITHIN THE CITY

Means	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Walk	24%	15%	20%
Public transportation	61	46	54
Own conveyance	9	28	17
Other private conveyances	6	12	9
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(13)	(6)	(19)

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF LONGEST DISTANCE TRAVEL

Frequency	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Daily	28%	33%	30%
Weekly	11	21	15
Once or twice a month	14	14	14
Monthly	16	9	13
Once or twice a year	30	24	28
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(18)	(8)	(26)

Even though many subjects reported extensive travel in the month preceding interview (veterans were the most traveled), the median miles traveled--18 in Baltimore and 10 in St. Louis--indicated that routine, daily travel was probably somewhat more far-ranging in Baltimore (see Table 15). Study results thus suggested that getting to places might be more of a limiting factor in St. Louis in that, compared to Baltimore, private transportation was more often involved and in that the routine radius of mobility was somewhat less.

TABLE 15

LONGEST DISTANCE (ONE-WAY) TRAVELED FROM HOME MONTH, BEFORE INTERVIEW

Distance	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
5 miles or less	21%	39%	29%
6-10 miles	21	13	18
11-25 miles	12	19	15
26-50 miles	18	5	12
51-100 miles	8	4	6
More than 100 miles	20	20	20
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(16)	(7)	(23)
Median miles traveled	(18)	(10)	(13)

Family Backgrounds

Up to the time they left school, most of the study subjects had lived in two-parent families (see Table 16). Approximately one-third of the subjects in each site, however, had grown up in fatherless families.

In Baltimore, 42 percent of the principal adults in the subjects' families--their fathers, in the case of two-parent families, or their mothers in the case of mother-only families--had not gone beyond eighth grade (see Table 17). In St. Louis, the educational achievement of principal adults tended to

be higher with only one-third completing 8 grades or less and one-third completing high school or more. Information concerning the education of principal adults tended to be incomplete in that about one-fifth of the subjects did not report their fathers' (or their mothers') educational attainment.

TABLE 16

FAMILY UNIT TO TIME OF DROPOUT

Subject lived with	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Both parents	61%	58%	60%
Mother only	31	29	30
Father only	2	3	2
Other relatives	5	8	6
Foster home	2	1	1
Other	0	1	0
TOTAL	101%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(3)	(4)

TABLE 17

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED BY PRINCIPAL ADULT

Highest Grade	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
7, or less	31%	19%	26%
8	11	14	12
9	13	5	9
10	18	10	15
11	8	19	12
12	15	22	18
Schooling additional to high school	4	11	3
TOTAL	100%	100%	95%
Unknown (number)	(33)	(27)	(60)

As would be expected in view of their education, relatively few of the principal adults in the study were high on the occupational ladder (see Table 18). Approximately one-fourth of the principal adults were reported by their sons to have had occupations at the skilled manual level or above,[1]

[1] Occupations were tabulated in accordance with the ranked categories proposed by Hollingshead. See:
August B. Hollingshead, Two-Factor Index of Social Position, 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. (1957).

and approximately two-fifths were reported to be either unskilled workers or to have had no occupation at all. Compared to Baltimore, very significantly more subjects in St. Louis reported more higher-level (skilled manual and above) principal adult occupations--a circumstance consistent with the higher educational levels reported for these principal adults.

In the year before dropout, approximately half of the subjects in each study grouping estimated the annual incomes of their families to have been about $4,000, or less (see Table 19). The number of persons dependent on these family incomes averaged 6.8 in Baltimore and 6.4 in St. Louis (see Table 20). At the time of dropout, most of the subjects reported that two or more family members were working and contributing to the family income (see Table 21). Eight percent of the subjects reported that no one in his family was earning at the time of dropout; and only one earner was reported by about 30 percent of the subjects.

TABLE 18

OCCUPATION OF PRINCIPAL ADULT

Occupation	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Professional, administrative	2%	6%	3%
Clerical and sales	4	8	5
Technician, small self-employed	5	2	4
Skilled manual	9	17	13
Machine operators, operatives	25	23	24
Semi-skilled	8	6	7
Unskilled	32	25	29
None (housewife, relief)	14	13	14
TOTAL	99%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(7)	(6)	(13)

TABLE 19

ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME IN THE YEAR BEFORE DROPOUT

Income	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Less than $1,000	2%	3%	3%
$1,000 - $1,999	7	7	7
$2,000 - $2,999	19	13	16
$3,000 - $3,999	20	26	23
$4,000 - $4,999	20	13	17
$5,000 - $5,999	12	17	14
$6,000 - $6,999	6	7	6
$7,000 - $7,999	6	4	5
$8,000 or more	7	11	9
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%
Median	$4,079	$4,129	$4,099
Unknown (number)	(5)	(13)	(18)

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF DROPOUT

Number	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
One to five	43%	47%	44%
Six to ten	47	50	48
Eleven to fifteen	10	4	7
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Median	6.8	6.4	6.6

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED AND CONTRIBUTING TO FAMILY INCOME, TIME OF DROPOUT

Number contributing	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
None	7%	8%	8%
One	30	31	30
Two, or more	63	62	61
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(2)	(3)

About one-fifth of the subjects reported that, up to the time they left school, their families had received welfare assistance "all" or "most" of the time (see Table 22). Indicators of economic status--the incidence of mother-only families, the education and occupation of principal adults, estimated annual income, number of contributors to family income, and the extent of welfare assistance--showed many similarities between the two study sites (see Table 23). Although the information supplied by subjects was incomplete concerning the educational level of their breadwinning parent, and although the subjects' competence to report family income might be questioned, the various indicators of economic status provided comparable information that added up family backgrounds characterized by poverty or near-poverty and by poor-paying jobs. Substantial proportions of subjects had backgrounds of even less effective employment, coming from mother-only families on relief; and some subjects--particularly in St. Louis--had backgrounds of relatively successful occupational activity.

TABLE 22

WELFARE RECEIPT PRIOR TO DROPOUT

Welfare received	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
All of the time	10%	16%	13%
Most of the time	11	2	7
Some of the time	8	9	8
Once or twice	2	0	1
None of the time	68	74	71
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(4)	(6)

TABLE 23

SELECTED VARIABLES, PRE-DROPOUT PERIOD

Variables	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Family unit prior to dropout			
Mother-only family	31%	29%	30%
Education of principal adult			
Completed 8th grade, or less	42	33	38
Occupation of principal adult			
Unskilled or none	46	38	43
Annual income, year before dropout			
Less than $4,000	48	49	49
Contributors to family income			
Two or more	63	62	61
Welfare receipt prior to dropout			
All or most of the time	21	18	20

Financial Eligibility

Poverty guidelines restrict enrollment in the Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps and in the Job Corps. Study results indicated, however, that financial ineligibility was--at most--a minor factor in non-participation. On the average, subjects who had never enrolled in Manpower programs were as qualified[1] as

[1]NYC Program Standard No. 1-65 (March 29, 1966), for example, set the eligibility standard for non-farm family of 6 at $4,135.

enrollee subjects in terms of average family income and number of dependents (see Table 23). Relatively more of the subjects who had never enrolled (35 percent as compared with 26 percent) reported annual family incomes of $5,000 or more, however, and the average number of dependents on family income was somewhat less among non-enrollees.

TABLE 23

ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME IN THE YEAR BEFORE DROPOUT,
NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD,
AND ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Family Income	Never enrolled			Ever enrolled		
	Reporting		Perscns	Reporting		Persons
	Number	Percent	Mean	Number	Percent	Mean
Below $1,000	7	3%	6.4	1	2%	4.0
$1,000 - 1,999	16	7	5.3	4	8	6.5
$2,000 - 2,999	36	15	5.5	11	23	6.8
$3,000 - 3,999	57	23	6.3	9	19	6.4
$4,000 - 4,999	40	16	5.5	10	21	6.5
$5,000 - 5,999	36	15	6.4	5	10	6.0
$6,000 - 6,999	16	6	6.1	2	4	8.0
$7,000 - 7,999	13	5	7.9	3	6	6.3
$8,000 or more	22	9	6.8	3	6	7.4
TOTAL	243	99%	6.1	48	99%	6.6
Median income		$4,125			$3,889	

Compared to all subjects who had enrolled in Out-of-School Manpower Programs, significantly fewer (12 percent as compared with 23 percent) subjects who had never enrolled reported no occupation for the principal adults in their families (see Table 24). Approximately the same percentages of subjects in the two groupings reported principal adult occupations in the unskilled and semi-skilled levels (31 percent among non-enrollees and 33 percent among enrollees), and the frequencies of occupations at higher levels were substantially the same.

Compared to subjects who had never enrolled, more enrollee subjects (26 percent as compared with 18 percent) reported that their families had received welfare assistance "all" or "most" of the time. In Baltimore the difference between enrollee and non-enrollee subjects was slight (23 percent and 21 percent, respectively); but, in St. Louis, enrollee subjects were far more apt to report this degree of welfare assistance (32 percent as compared with 15 percent). These results indicated that being in a "welfare" family might be a factor in enrollment. On the whole, however, the various indicators of family financial status at the time of dropout suggest that relatively few of the study subjects were not financially qualified to participate in Federal Manpower Programs.

TABLE 24

OCCUPATION OF PRINCIPAL ADULT BY SUBJECTS' ENROLLMENT IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Occupations	Never Enrolled N=259	Enrolled N=50
Professional, administrative	4%	0%
Clerical and sales	5	6
Technicians, small self-employed	4	4
Skilled manual	13	13
Machine operators, operatives	25	18
Semi-skilled	6	15
Unskilled	31	21
None (housewife, relief)	12	23
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(11)	(2)

Dropout

Study subjects were asked, "After September, 1966, did you ever quit school before graduating from high school?" They were then asked when they had left school, and the last grade that they had completed in school.

Compared to the dropout dates derived from school records, Baltimore subjects tended to report earlier dropouts (see Table 25). Thirty-four percent of the Baltimore subjects, for example, reported dropping out in the last quarter of 1966, while school records showed only 17 percent of the dropouts

in this period. On the other hand, only 13 percent of the Baltimore subjects reported dropping out in September-October, 1967, when school records showed that 39 percent of the dropouts occurred.

The tendency of subjects to give earlier dropout dates might be explained by the facts that (1) student-initiated dropouts would be known to the student before they were known to the school, and (2) lags inherent in record-keeping would tend to post-date dropouts. The concentration of school-recorded Baltimore dropouts in September-October, for example, strongly suggested an accumulation of dropouts that were recorded in connection with the annual school attendance listings rather than mass exits in these two months. It thus seems likely that, in Baltimore, some absent students were carried as actively enrolled even though the students considered themselves to have dropped out.

A somewhat different situation obtained in St. Louis where 19 percent of the subjects dated their withdrawal from school later than October, 1967. Here, again, school records might have been artifacts to some extent. Records in St. Louis involved weekly withdrawal reports, and some of these withdrawals might not have been considered permanent dropouts by the students.

TABLE 25

SUBJECT AND SCHOOL REPORTS OF DROPOUT MONTH

Dropout Month	Baltimore Subject N=176	Baltimore School N=176	St. Louis Subject N=133	St. Louis School N=133
	Percent		Percent	
Earlier than October, 1966	12%	0%	8%	0%
1966				
October	7	0	4	16
November	16	9	4	11
December	10	8	3	9
1967				
January	7	10	10	5
February	6	8	9	15
March	3	6	3	6
April	7	12	4	4
May	5	4	9	6
June	11	5	9	6
July-August	1	0	1	0
September	5	14	8	7
October	8	25	8	16
Later than October, 1967	2	0	19	0
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%	101%
Unspecified (number)	(7)	(15)	(9)	(0)

Interview data indicated that, on the average, Baltimore subjects had dropped out of school 28.8 months before July 1, 1969, while St. Louis subjects had dropped out of school 25 months before (see Table 26). Compared to school record data, subjects' reports averaged about three months more months out of school in Baltimore and about three months less out of school in St. Louis. These results suggest that dropping out of school is an episode that is frequently not objectively identifiable at the time of its occurrence. Although the dates supplied by the study subjects were more apt to be affected by inaccuracies of recall, the apparent tendency of Baltimore records to post-date dropout--and of St. Louis records to anticipate dropout--suggest that school records reflect characteristics of record-keeping systems as well as student attendance. The "true" dropout dates thus probably covered a somewhat greater span than that demarcated by school record dates of dropout.

TABLE 26

MEAN MONTHS SINCE DROPOUT (AS OF JULY 1, 1969)
AND MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE OF INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS

	Baltimore		St. Louis		Total	
	Number Reporting	Mean	Number Reporting	Mean	Number Reporting	Mean
Months since dropout	169	28.8	124	25.0	293	27.2
Highest school graded completed	173	9.3	132	9.8	305	9.5

On the average, interviewed subjects reported that they had completed 9.5 school grades, while school records showed an average completion of 8.8 grades (see Table 28). Subjects in both sites thus reported higher average grade completion than that indicated by respective school records. This discrepancy suggests a tendency to report highest grade level (that is, dropout grade) rather than the highest completed grade. The tendency to hang on to the highest level of school experience probably affects to some extent the responses to many inquiries[1] phrased in terms of highest completed grade.

TABLE 28

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS
COMPARISONS OF SUBJECT AND SCHOOL INFORMATION, BY SITE

Highest School Grade	Baltimore		St. Louis		Total	
	Subject	School	Subject	School	Subject	School
	N=176		N=133		N=309	
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
7, or less	10%	29%	2%	0%	6%	18%
8	15	15	8	26	13	20
9	26	26	24	35	25	27
10	29	18	40	26	34	22
11	20	13	25	13	21	12
12	0	0	2	0	1	0
TOTAL	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	99%
Mean grades completed	9.3	8.5	9.8	9.2	9.5	8.8
Unknown (number)	(3)	(3)	(1)	(0)	(4)	(3)

[1]Some inquiries, particularly those of a practical nature from peers, may produce reverse distortion. See, for example,

Elliot Liebow, Tally's Corner (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company), 1967, pp. 54-55:

I graduated from high school but I didn't know anything. I'm dumb. Most of the time I don't even say I graduated, 'cause then somebody asks me a question and I can't answer it, and they think I was lying about graduating . . . They graduated me but I didn't know anything. I had lousy grades but I guess they wanted to get rid of me. (Richard, a Baltimore high school graduate, is being quoted).

Reasons for Leaving School

The subject's reasons for leaving school were ascertained by handing him a card listing 14 reasons and asking him to indicate which, if any, were his reasons for leaving school. Additional responses were provided for in an "Other" category, and interviewers were instructed to probe in order to find out as much as possible about the subject's reasons. After getting all reasons, the subject was asked to indicate his main reason for leaving school.

Responses were tabulated in two broad categories: reasons that related primarily to the school environment; and reasons that emphasized outside circumstances. The division could not, of course, be rigidly recognized: because outside alternatives were often implied in reasons that emphasized school or schooling, (or vice versa), and several reasons might actually be involved.

Three out of five subjects in both sites left school mainly because of their school experience (see Table 29). Very significantly more St. Louis subjects (37 percent, as compared with Baltimore's 9 percent) reported that they left because they had been suspended or expelled. Baltimore subjects, on the other hand, were significantly more apt to report problems with school work ("some subjects too difficult" or "not learning anything") and that they left because they "lost interest" in school. The main reasons for leaving school thus tended to emphasize the subject's rejection of school in Baltimore and to emphasize the school's rejection of the subject in St. Louis. With the exception of the St. Louis subjects who reported suspension or expulsion, most of the main reasons for leaving school implied choice rather than compulsion.

TABLE 29

MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING SCHOOL

Main reason	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
The School Environment			
Academic:			
Problems with school work	5%	2%	4%
Not learning anything	10	0	6
Interpersonal:			
Problems with teachers, students	9	5	7
Suspended or expelled	9	37	21
General:			
Lost interest	31	19	26
Subtotal, school	64%	63%	64%
Outside Interest or Pressure			
Employment:			
Got married, wife to support	3%	4%	4%
Had to help family	8	4	6
Needed money for expenses	11	10	11
Would rather work	6	12	9
Other outside:			
Wanted to enlist	3	3	3
Jailed	3	2	2
Personal, family problems	1	0	1
Illness	1	2	1
Moved	1	2	1
Subtotal, outside	37%	39%	38%
TOTAL	101%	102%	102%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(5)	(9)

In the first part of their responses, when all reasons for leaving school were sought, (see Table 30), Baltimore subjects averaged markedly more responses (2.1) than St. Louis subjects (1.4). Compared to their main reasons for leaving school, the total rationale of Baltimore subjects gave added weight to two school-related reasons ("some subjects too difficult" and "problems with teachers and/or students") and to two preferred alternative activities ("needed money for expenses" and "would rather work"). Among St. Louis subjects, comparisons of all reasons with main reasons showed that school problems ("some subjects too difficult", "not learning anything" and "problems with teachers and/or students") were the most important contributory causes of leaving school. As with the main reasons for leaving school, about three-fifths of all reasons were school-oriented. The additional responses in this range of reasons brought out more difficulties with the school environment than were apparent in the subjects' reports of main reasons. The additional responses falling outside the school-oriented reasons emphasized the attraction of working and earning spending money.

TABLE 30

ALL REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL

All Reasons	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
The School Environment			
Academic:			
Problems with school work	17%	5%	12%
Not learning anything	23	3	15
Interpersonal:			
Problems with teachers, students	26	12	20
Suspended or expelled	13	41	25
General:			
Lost interest	52	26	41
Subtotal, school	131%	87%	113%
Outside Interest or Pressure			
Employment:			
Got married, wife to support	5%	4%	4%
Had to help family	10	6	8
Needed money for expenses	30	16	24
Would rather work	23	16	20
Other outside:			
Wanted to enlist	8	5	7
Jailed	3	2	2
Personal, family problems	2	5	3
Illness	1	0	0
Moved	0	1	0
Subtotal, outside	82%	55%	68%
TOTAL[a]	213%	142%	181%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(5)	(9)

[a]More than one response possible, so totals can be more than 100%.

Information concerning reasons for leaving school was also secured from school records, but the results did not throw much additional light on why students dropped out. In Baltimore, school records showed that 76 percent of the study subjects dropped out because they were "overage" while no reasons were recorded for 18 percent of the subjects (see Table 31). School records in St. Louis involved more categories, but also contained a large number of "no reports" (24 percent). Of the 22 Baltimore subjects who reported that they had left school because they were "suspended or expelled", only one, according to school records, was expelled and the rest were either "overage" or "no report." Of the 52 St. Louis subjects who reported suspension or expulsion, 50 percent, according to school records, were involved in disciplinary or academic suspension and reasons were not reported for 20 percent. These results indicated that school records may considerably underestimate the extent of rejection by schools that is experienced by dropouts.

TABLE 31

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, SCHOOL RECORDS

Reasons	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133
	Percent	
Expelled, Disciplinary suspension	1%	26%
Overage	76	
Failed to graduate	2	
Academic suspension		6
Nonattendance		21
No interest		12
Employment	1	6
Armed forces	1	1
Marriage		2
Needed at home		2
Moved	1	2
Jailed	1	
No report	18	24
TOTAL	101%	102%

Liking for School

Following the questions concerning leaving school, study subjects were asked to rate their liking for school on a five-point scale ranging from "1" (hated it) to "5" (liked it very much), and to tell in their own words why they had rated school as they did.

On the average, study subjects rated their liking for school above the midpoint of the scale (see Table 32), and St. Louis subjects averaged higher ratings (3.6) than Baltimore subjects (3.3). The open-end responses given as reasons for the like-school ratings were broadly characterized according to the negative or positive tone of the response (see Table 33). In many instances, these responses indicated that the subject's current views concerning the value of education, as well as his remembered like (or dislike) for school as such, were reflected in the ratings. This comprehensive "reasoning" was especially evident in responses that contained reflections on dropping out, such as "wish I'd stayed in" and often implied attitudes that might not have been present at the time of dropout. In all, 30 percent of the subjects expressed negative attitudes, 10 percent of the subjects expressed neutrality ("neither liked it nor hated it") and the rest of the subjects expressed positive attitudes ranging from remembered good times to general endorsements of schooling and education.

Four categories of negative attitude were tabulated: criticisms of school (for example, "most teachers didn't care," "lessons too hard," and

"teachers were biased"); personal or social (for example, "didn't like sitting up in classes," "it was dull," and "everybody was dropping out"); qualified (for example, "didn't like it much but know it was a good thing," "wanted to stay but got put out," and "never really had a chance to learn, but like it"); and simple statements of dislike ("didn't like school"). Very significantly more Baltimore than St. Louis subjects expressed criticisms of the school and stated dislike of school.

TABLE 32

LIKE-SCHOOL RATING

Rating	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1 - Hated it	6%	4%	5%
2	16	10	14
3	40	39	39
4	20	22	21
5 - Liked it very much	18	26	21
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Mean rating	3.3	3.6	3.4
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(1)

TABLE 33

REASONS FOR LIKE-SCHOOL RATINGS

Reasons	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Expressions of negative attitude			
Criticisms of school	6%	4%	5%
Personal or social	8	5	6
Qualified	15	4	10
Simple statements of dislike	10	8	9
Subtotal, negative	39%	21%	30%
Neutral	10%	10%	10%
Expressions of positive attitude			
Appreciations of school	20%	32%	25%
Personal or social	9	13	11
Simple statement of liking	14	16	15
Dropout explanations	8	9	9
Subtotal, positive	51%	70%	60%
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(2)	(5)

Expressions of positive attitudes toward school and schooling were tabulated in similar categories. Significantly more St. Louis than Baltimore subjects expressed appreciations of school (for example, "liked because of what I could learn," "would like to have graduated," and "like the teachers"). Personal or social reasons for liking school (for example "liked because of the crowd that was going," "had a mellow time," and "got to meet new people"), simple statements of liking (for example, "nothing wrong with school" or "better than working"), and responses that alluded to dropping out (for example, "quit school to get a job with the aim of going back," "wanted money in my pocket and school didn't put it there," and "alright, I wish I had stayed in") occurred with about the same frequency in each site. These "dropout explanations" clearly continued the train of thought started with the questions concerning dropping out. They were considered as positive "reasons" because they were evidently premised on an acceptance of school, or, at any rate, they implied that dislike for school, as such, was not a factor in the dropout situation.

The criticisms of school expressed by two-fifths of the Baltimore, and by one-fifth of the St. Louis subjects, indicated that anti-school attitudes might be a persistent barrier to the participation of dropouts in training programs perceived to involve school-like experiences. On the other hand, some of the study subjects had come to value schooling since dropping out and might, therefore, appreciate opportunities to repair their academic deficiencies.

Ability in Reading and Math

Most study subjects felt that their reading and math ability was "as good as," or "better than," that of the average high school graduate (see Table 34); but the majority proportions of math ability were significantly smaller than those of reading ability (64 percent as compared with 84 percent in Baltimore and 75 percent as compared with 86 percent in St. Louis). Baltimore subjects' comparatively poor opinion of their math ability was most marked--compared to reports of reading ability, very significantly more Baltimore subjects rated their math ability "worse" than that of high school graduates (36 percent as compared with 16 percent); and, also, compared to St. Louis reports of math ability, significantly more Baltimore subjects reported "worse" (36 percent as compared with 24 percent).

It is possible that the definite perception of math deficiency would inhibit subjects from involving themselves in situations that might include math demands (for example, application procedures for employment or training programs that might include arithmetic tests). On the other hand, training opportunities that offered a chance to improve math ability might be perceived as particularly relevant by those (31 percent of all subjects) who rated their math ability as "worse" than that of the average high school graduate. Similarly, those who felt their reading ability was "worse" (15 percent of all subjects) might avoid reading situations and might be particularly interested in improving their reading ability.

Compared to subjects who had never enrolled in Manpower Programs,

significantly more enrollee subjects reported extremes of reading and math ability (see Table 35). The tendency of enrollee subjects to rate themselves as "better" or "worse", rather than "the same", may have been, to some extent, an effect of program participation. Although these results are difficult to interpret, they are not inconsistent with the view that manpower programs can appeal to dropouts who perceive deficiencies in their academic skills.

TABLE 34

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF READING AND MATH ABILITY

Compared to average high school graduate	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Reading ability			
Better than average	12%	17%	14%
Worse than average	16	14	15
About the same	72	69	71
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Math ability			
Better than average	9%	11%	10%
Worse than average	36	24	31
About the same	55	64	59
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%

TABLE 35

READING AND MATH ABILITY COMPARISONS, ENROLLEES AND NON-ENROLLEES

Compared to average high school graduate, ability was	Reading		Math	
	Enrollee N=50	Non-Enrollee N=259	Enrollee N=50	Non-Enrollee N=259
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Better than average	22%	12%	18%	9%
Worse than average	22	14	38	30
The same as average	56	74	44	62
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	101%

Vocational Usefulness of Schooling

In Baltimore, two-thirds of the study subjects reported that their schooling had been without value as vocational preparation (see Table 36). Only half (very significantly fewer) St. Louis subjects, on the other hand, reported that their schooling had been vocationally useless.

Subjects who thought that their education had been of value as vocational preparation placed about equal emphasis on academic and vocational course work. Approximately 10 percent of the subjects noted preparational values in learned vocational behaviors (how to get and hold a job, for example) and social skills (how to get along with people, for example), or in combinations of course work and behavioral skills.

These results suggested that, if a young man felt the need for vocational preparation, the perception that schooling had been useless in this respect might imply (1) receptivity towards training programs perceived to be vocationally useful and (2) disinterest in school-like training programs.

TABLE 36

USEFULNESS OF SCHOOLING AS VOCATIONAL PREPARATION

Usefulness	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Useful			
Academic course work only	13%	19%	15%
Vocational course work only	13	17	14
Vocational behaviors only	7	4	6
Social skills only	0	2	1
Combinations of above	2	6	3
Unknown	0	2	1
Subtotal, useful	35%	50%	40%
Not useful	65%	50%	60%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(6)	(8)

Schooling After Dropout

Most of the study subjects did not return to school after dropping out in 1966-67, and most of those who returned made little academic progress.

In Baltimore, 87 percent of the subjects did not return to full-time school after dropping out (see Table 37), and half of those who returned stayed in school less than one year. Two percent of all Baltimore subjects, however, not only returned to school but completed 12th grade. Comparatively more St. Louis subjects returned to school (20 percent as compared with 13 percent), and 7 percent of all St. Louis subjects not only returned to school but completed 12th grade.

Approximately one-fifth of the Baltimore subjects tried to continue their education in special classes outside of full-time school, and one-twentieth of the Baltimore subjects completed one or more grades in this way (see Table 38). Although comparatively more St. Louis subjects enrolled in special classes, the percentage of subjects who passed the GED was the same in both sites--2 percent.

TABLE 37

RETURN TO FULL-TIME SCHOOL AFTER DROPOUT

Return	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Returned, in school			
Less than one year	6%	8%	7%
One year	3	5	4
More than one year	1	5	2
Unknown	3	2	3
Subtotal, returned	13%	20%	16%
Did not return to school	87%	80%	84%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(8)	(8)
Completed 12th grade	2%	7%	4%

TABLE 38

ENROLLMENT IN SPECIAL CLASSES AFTER DROPOUT

Enrollment	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Enrolled, grades completed			
None	17%	30%	22%
One	3	2	3
Two	1	0	0
Unknown	1	0	1
Subtotal, enrolled	22%	32%	26%
Did not enroll	78%	68%	74%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(8)	(11)
Passed GED	2%	2%	2%

All told, 6 percent of the young men who dropped out of school in 1966-67 and were interviewed subjects in this study had managed to complete high school at the time of interview--4 percent by returning to full-time school, and 2 percent by passing the GED. Although St. Louis dropouts were somewhat more apt to continue their schooling, the great majority of subjects in both sites had not noticeably added to their educational achievement after leaving school.

Vocational Courses After Leaving School

Only 7 percent of all interviewed subjects reported having enrolled in vocational courses, other than those provided by Manpower Training Programs,[1] after dropping out of school (see Table 39). Most of the subjects who reported enrollment in such courses stayed in the courses 6 months or less, and less than half completed their courses. These results indicated that community resources outside of the school system and other than those provided through Manpower Training Programs were a negligible factor in the preparations of dropout youths for the world of work.

TABLE 39

VOCATIONAL COURSES AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL

Vocational Courses	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Enrolled in vocational course or courses	7%	6%	7%
In course 6 months or less	6	4	5
Completed course	3	2	2

[1]The experiences of subjects with Federal Manpower Programs is reported in Chapter VI.

Military Service

Approximately three-fourths of all study subjects known to have experience in the Armed Forces were in active service and not interviewed (see Table 40). Interviewed subjects thus provided a fragmentary source of information concerning the effects of military service on employment and preparations for the world of work.

Ten percent of the interviewed subjects were, or had been, in the Armed Forces at the time of interview (see Table 41), and about one-third of these reported training for civilian occupations while in military service. While military service might be an important source of vocational training,[1] so far as interviewed subjects were concerned, study results showed very slight effects in this respect.

Most interviewed study subjects (61 percent) either reported no draft classification or reported 1A or 1-S, or 2-S. These subjects faced the prospect of possible military service. There was little explicit reference, however, to the effect of possible periods of military service on employment activities. One subject, not working at the time of interview, said that he was waiting to be called into military service, and several subjects mentioned that military service might interfere with the achievement of their occupational goals.

[1]It could be speculated that interviewed subjects with, and non-interviewed subjects reported to have had, experience in the Armed Forces, together with interviewed subjects practically exempted (2A, 3A, 4F and 1Y) constituted a universe of youth experience and eligibility vis-a-vis the draft. If so, practical exemption would be in the neighborhood of 39 percent, and three-fifths of dropout youths would experience military service. If one-third of these received training for civilian occupations while in the Armed Forces, military service might be estimated to provide vocational training for approximately one-fifth of dropout youths.

Twenty-eight percent of the interviewed subjects had draft classifications (2A, 3A, 4F, and 1Y) that, for all practical purposes, exempted them from military service. The draft outcomes (about two-fifths of the known induction examination outcomes) suggested that a number of subjects who were 1A or without Selective Service classification at the time of interview would also be practically uninvolved with military service and its potentials both to interfere with and ultimatley to enhance preparations for, or the achievement of, civilian employment.[1]

TABLE 40

INTERVIEW STATUS AND MILITARY SERVICE

Status and Service	Baltimore N	Baltimore %	St. Louis N	St. Louis %	Total N	Total %
Interviewed						
Completed military service	8	12%	8	12%	16	12%
In military service	8	12	6	9	14	10
Not interviewed						
In military service	51	76%	54	79%	105	78%
TOTAL	67	100%	68	100%	135	100%

[1]The reader will recognize that these results were fragmentary and did not provide bases for definite conslusions. They have been reported in order to make available all study results that might shed some light on the experience of dropout youth as well as on the problems of researching that experience.

TABLE 41

MILITARY SERVICE AND SELECTIVE SERVICE CLASSIFICATION

Service or Classification	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Military service[a]			
1 year or less	2%	4%	3%
13-24 months	5	5	5
25-36 months	2	2	2
Subtotal, military	9%	11%	10%
Selective service classification			
1-A	39%	35%	37%
In reserve component (1-D)	2	0	1
Qualified in emergency (1-Y)	12	22	16
Overage liability	0	1	0
Deferred:			
Occupational deferment (2-A)	1	0	1
Dependency deferment (3-A)	5	4	4
Student deferment (1-S, 2-S)	1	10	5
Not qualified (4-F)	11	2	7
Subtotal, selective service	71%	74%	71%
No service or classification[b]	21%	17%	19%
TOTAL	101%	102%	100%
Vocational training in military service	3%	3%	3%

[a]Includes 8 subjects in active military service.

[b]Includes 2 percent "no report" in Selective Service classification.

Family Circumstances at Time of Interview

Most of the study subjects were single men when they were interviewed in the summer of 1969 (see Table 42). Fifteen percent of the Baltimore subjects, and 23 percent of the St. Louis subjects, were or had been married, and most of the marriages had occurred in 1968 or 1969. About one-fifth of the marriages contracted by St. Louis subjects, had eventuated in separation at the time of interview.

In both sites more subjects were fathers than were husbands (see Table 43). This difference was very significant in Baltimore where about one-third of all subjects were fathers but only 14 percent were, or had been, married. Although also observable in St. Louis, this difference was not significant in the midwest site.

TABLE 42

MARITAL STATUS, AND WHEN MARRIED (MONTHS BEFORE JULY 1, 1969)

Marital Status and When Married	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ever Married			
Married up to 6 months before	3%	8%	5%
Married 7-13 months before	5	8	6
Married more than 19 months before	6	5	6
Married, when unknown	1	2	2
Subtotal, married	15%	23%	19%
Never Married	85%	77%	81%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Separated	3%	6%	4%

TABLE 43

CHILDREN AND NUMBER LIVING WITH SUBJECT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Children and Number Living with Subject	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Children			
None living with subject	18%	17%	17%
One living with subject	9	9	9
Two living with subject	3	2	3
Three living with subject	2	0	1
Four living with subject	1	0	1
Subtotal, children	33%	28%	31%
No children	66%	71%	69%
TOTAL	99%	99%	100%

Four out of five study subjects were still living in parental family units at the time of interview (see Table 44). Approximately one in ten had married and become the head of his own household. The remaining subjects (8 percent) were living by themselves or with friends, or in jail.

Even though 80 percent of the subjects were still living at home, only 29 percent reported that their parental families were their major source of support (see Table 45). Significantly more St. Louis subjects reported that

their families were their major source of support. Most of the subjects, however, 67 percent in Baltimore and 57 percent in St. Louis, reported themselves to be primarily supported by their own earnings. In addition a few subjects had achieved financial independence from their families through undesirable circumstances. These subjects were either dependent on welfare or their wive's earnings, or were supported by their own hustling or by jail maintenance.

Additional sources of support were reported by 16 percent of the subjects (see Table 46). Comparisons of all reported sources of support with major sources of support indicated that multiple sources of support were most apt to involve parental support and the subjects' earnings; that is, major parental support was augmented by earnings or vice versa. In Baltimore, also, "other" sources of support were important sources of additional income.

With respect to family circumstance variables, discussed above, there were few significant differences between study sites and composite results thus provided a fair reflection of all study subjects. These young men were, in the summer of 1969, in varying phases of development toward social adulthood (see Table 47). Most were not yet full-fledged adults in that they were still living at home, and 29 percent were still primarily dependent on their parents.

TABLE 44

FAMILY UNIT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Subject was living	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
With wife, no other adults	7%	12%	9%
With wife and adult relatives	5	2	3
Alone or with friends	3	5	4
In parental unit[a]	79	81	80
In jail or workhouse	6	1	4
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(2)	(3)

[a]Includes one- and two-parent families and *in loco parentis* units (adult relatives, foster homes).

TABLE 45

MAJOR SOURCE OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Major Support	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Subject's family	23%	36%	29%
Subject's earnings	67	57	63
Other			
Wife's earnings	1	2	1
Welfare	1	2	1
Hustling	1	2	1
Jail maintenance	7	1	5
Subtotal, other	10%	7%	8%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)

TABLE 46

ALL SOURCES OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Sources of Support	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Subject's family	27%	45%	35%
Subject's earnings[a]	70	62	66
Other			
Wife's earnings	3	3	3
Welfare	1	2	2
Unemployment, disability comp.	3	1	2
Hustling	2	1	2
Jail	7	1	6
Subtotal, other	16%	8%	15%
TOTAL[b]	113%	115%	116%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)

[a]Includes training allowance in one instance. Training allowance was not principal source of support.

[b]More than one response possible, so total percentage more than 100.

TABLE 47

SELECTED VARIABLES, ALL SUBJECTS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Variables	All interviewed subjects N=309
Average age (7/1/69)	20 years
Married, head of own household	14%
Children, at home or elsewhere	31%
Primarily supported by own earnings	63%
Living in parental family unit	79%
Primarily supported by parental family	29%

Family circumstances might influence participation in manpower training programs in serveral ways. The assumption of family responsibilities, for example, might not only increase the participation of young men in the civilian work force,[1] but might also reinforce their motivation to enhance their vocational prospects through training. At the same time, the force of family circumstances might bar such young men from considering programs whose allowances were less than earnings in available, albeit occupationally undesirable, jobs. On the other hand, young men without family responsibilities might lack the motivation to sacrifice time to learning when their financial needs for "spending money" could be met through combinations of family support and casual jobs.[2]

Ways of Looking for Jobs

Following a number of questions concerning specific employment experiences, subjects were asked how they usually looked for jobs.[3] Answers to this question were structured through a response card that suggested nine job-hunting activities and also provided for "other" responses (see Table 48).

[1]O'Boyle has noted: "The strikingly lower rates /of unemployment/ for married men suggest that family formation alters a young man's attitude toward work, making him more willing than the unmarried man to accept and hold a given job." (Edward J. O'Boyle, "From Classroom to Workshop: A Hazardous Journey," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 91, No. 12, p. 11)

[2]Harwood has concluded: "Many /ghetto/ boys are underemployed and subemployed because they value leisure as much as money which leads them to seek only as much work as is needed to get by with enough of each." (Edwin Harwood, "Youth unemployment--A tale of two ghettos," The Public Interest, No. 17, pp. 78-85).

[3]Employment experiences are reported in Chapter V.

Baltimore subjects reported more job-hunting activities[1] than St. Louis subjects; and, compared to St. Louis subjects, Baltimore subjects emphasized asking friends and family connections. St. Louis subjects, on the other hand, placed more reliance on the Employment Service and on direct personal inquiry at company hiring locations.

TABLE 48

WAYS OF LOOKING FOR A JOB

Ways	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Asked friends	61%	29%	47%
Asked family, relatives, family friends	43	9	28
Checked local newspaper ads	53	38	47
Checked out-of-town newspaper ads	3	2	3
Private employment agencies	15	3	10
State Employment Service, YOC	39	36	38
Applied directly on news of possible job	30	20	26
Inquired directly for possible job	30	37	33
Applied to companies outside the city	3	2	3
Other	2	2	2
TOTAL[a]	279%	178%	237%

[a]More than one way could be reported

[1]The fact that Baltimore subjects used more options in their responses gave the impression that they may have been more energetic in their job hunting. In general, however, Baltimore subjects tended to give more answers when options were provided, and this impression might thus be misleading.

Attitudes Toward Self, Work, and Life

A number of interview questions asked the subject to rate himself or his experiences in various contexts. Responses to these questions, reported below, indicated attitudes that might condition effective participation in manpower programs.

Comparisons with Friends

Several questions asked the subject to compare himself with "most of the young men who are your friends." In general, responses to these questions indicated that most study subjects did not consider themselves to be in a dropout-disadvantaged world. According to study subjects, most of their friends either had not dropped out of school or had completed at least 10th grade (see Table 49). Three-fourths of the study subjects, on the other hand, had left school before completing 10th grade, and it can be concluded that level of schooling did not restrict the social circles of study subjects.

About half of the study subjects reported that most or all of their friends had full-time jobs (see Table 50)--roughly the same percentage as those reporting full-time employment at the time of interview. At the same time, a little more than one-fifth of the subjects reported that "only a few" or "none" of their friends had full-time jobs. In view of the importance of friends as information sources, subjects in social circles where unemployment was rife were at a disadvantage. If, for example, they heard about a possible job from their unemployed friends, they might have to compete with these same friends for the job. Subjects whose friends were, for the most part, employed,

however, might reasonably count their circle of friends as a resource in maintaining their own employment.

Nine out of ten study subjects considered themselves to be as well off, or better off, than most of their friends (see Table 51). Relative disadvantage, with its implications for, on the one hand, poor self-concept, or, on the other hand, stimulation toward greater efforts to succeed, was thus a comparatively minor circumstance.

Peer groups can powerfully influence the activities of their members. Since these influences operate to achieve identification with and conformity to the group, the results just reported indicate that peer groups might not be a factor in stimulating dropouts to utilize manpower programs. Although study subjects had considerably less schooling than their friends, most of them felt as well off as their friends. Among those dropouts whose friends, like themselves, had failed to achieve satisfactory adjustments to the world of work, the peer group might have served to reinforce poor employment adjustments, and to impede activities directed toward vocational improvement such as enrollment in manpower programs.

TABLE 49

SCHOOLING OF MOST OF SUBJECT'S FRIENDS

Schooling	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Graduated from high school	36%	42%	38%
Dropped out after 10th grade	38	29	34
Dropped out before finishing 10th grade	26	29	28
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(4)	(5)

TABLE 50

EXTENT OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG SUBJECT'S FRIENDS

How many friends have full-time jobs?	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
All	12%	9%	11%
Most	42	34	39
Some	27	29	28
Only a few	19	20	19
None	1	8	4
TOTAL	101%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(4)	(7)

TABLE 51

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF HIS SUCCESS COMPARED TO FRIENDS

Compared to most of your friends you are now getting along	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Much better than they	14%	18%	15%
A little better than they	21	19	20
About the same	51	55	53
Not as well as they	10	4	7
Much worse than they	5	4	5
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)

Family Attitudes

About three out of five subjects reported that what their families had expected of them while they were growing up had been "just about right." (see Table 52). While this response did not indicate much about the character of expectations, it did indicate harmony between subjects and their families with respect to the subjects' activities. Two extreme responses (families expected "too much" or "not enough"), on the other hand, were reported by 15 percent of the subjects and indicated critical attitudes toward families. Finally, two responses ("too much" and "a great deal") indicated a high

expectation, while two other responses ("not very much" and "not enough") indicated low expectations. Very significantly more St. Louis than Baltimore subjects (29 percent, as compared with 16 percent) reported high family expectations while a reverse pattern was found with respect to low expectations (13 percent as compared with 23 percent).

The influence of "significant others"--parents, teachers, and friends--has often been advanced as an important variable in educational and occupational attainment.[1] Some reflection of this variable was apparent in reports of family expectations, and it was noteworthy that (1) the weight of family expectations was greater in St. Louis, and (2) family expectations could be "too much." In such cases, family pressures had not only failed to keep the subject in school but had possibly become a factor in family discord.

About three out of five subjects reported that their families had "usually" or "always" been fair with them (see Table 53), and about half of the subjects reported that their wishes were "usually" or "always" considered in family decisions affecting them (see Table 54). Extreme negative responses ("usually" or "always" unfair, "seldom" or "never" involved in decisions affecting him) were infrequent.

[1] See, for example,
Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: Wiley, 1967), p. 165; and
William H. Sewell, Archibald O. Haller and Alejandro Portes, "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process," American Sociological Review, Vol. 34, No. 1 (February, 1969), pp.82-92.

Two-thirds of all subjects reported that their families had been "very interested" in the subject's activities (see Table 55). Very significantly more St. Louis (75 percent) than Baltimore (60 percent) subjects, however, reported this degree of family interest.

About three out of five subjects reported that, so far as strictness was concerned, their families had been "just about right" (see Table 56). Noticeably more Baltimore (31 percent) than St. Louis (22 percent) subjects, however, reported that their families had been "rather easy" or "too easy" with them.

Considered together, reports of family attitudes suggested that the families of Baltimore dropouts were more frequently seen as having low expectations, and less interested in their children's welfare. This impression was consistent with the subjects' reports of their families' attitudes toward leaving school (see Table 57). Compared to Baltimore, more St. Louis subjects reported that their families had been opposed to their dropout, and fewer St. Louis subjects reported that their families "didn't care." The extent of the differences between the two sites, however, were not statistically significant in this respect. In both sites the weight of family influence was against dropping out of school, and in both sites family wishes and expectations had been disappointed by the subjects' dropout. It can thus be concluded that family influence was generally ineffective in keeping study subjects in school.

St. Louis subjects were significantly less apt to express maladjustment to schooling by agreeing with the statement, "Most of your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time " (see Table 58). Although mean differences between the two sites with respect to most attitudinal responses were not statistically significant, it was of interest that St. Louis subjects consistently expressed a most industrious attitude, disagreeing more with "It is better to live for today . . ." and "Most work is dull . . .", and agreeing more with "If you try hard enough . . ." Subjects in both sites averaged the same degree of agreement with the statement "You feel . . . as capable and smart as other people."

TABLE 52

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY EXPECTATIONS OF HIM

What family expected was	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Too much	7%	11%	9%
A great deal	9	18	13
Just about right	61	58	59
Not very much	17	8	13
Not enough	6	5	6
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 53

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY FAIRNESS TO HIM

In dealing with subject, family was	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Always fair	23%	30%	26%
Usually fair	38	32	35
Sometimes fair, sometimes unfair	35	35	35
Usually unfair	3	3	3
Always unfair	2	1	1
TOTAL	101%	101%	100%

TABLE 54

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN FAMILY DECISIONS CONCERNING HIM

How often did family pay attention to what you wanted?	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Always	22%	18%	20%
Usually	24	38	30
Sometimes	42	32	38
Seldom	9	10	9
Never	3	2	3
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%

TABLE 55

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY INTEREST IN HIM

How interested was your family in what you were doing?	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Very interested	60%	75%	66%
Somewhat interested	38	22	31
Not at all interested	3	2	3
TOTAL	101%	99%	100%

TABLE 56

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY STRICTNESS WITH HIM

How strict was your family	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Too strict	5%	5%	5%
Quite strict	6	10	8
Just about right	58	63	60
Rather easy	22	17	20
Too easy	9	5	7
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 57

SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF FAMILY ATTITUDE TO HIS DROPOUT

When you dropped out of school, what was your family's attitude?	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Were in favor	4%	6%	5%
Were opposed	78	85	81
Didn't care	12	6	9
Divided opinion	6	4	5
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(7)	(12)

TABLE 58

ATTITUDES TOWARD SELF, WORK, AND LIFE, MEAN RATINGS[a]

Attitudes	Mean Degree of Agreement		
	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
It is better to live for today, and let tomorrow take care of itself	2.3	2.5	2.4
Most work is dull and boring	2.5	2.7	2.6
You feel that your chances of having a happy home life in the future are good	1.8	1.7	1.7
You feel that so far in your life you have been very lucky	2.1	1.9	2.0
When people "bug" you, they should be told off even if it means getting into trouble	2.6	2.7	2.7
You would say that you have a lot of confidence in yourself	1.5	1.3	1.4
Most of your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time	2.9	3.2	3.0
Most people cannot be trusted	2.3	2.4	2.3
If you try hard enough, you have a chance of succeeding in whatever you want to do	1.4	1.2	1.3
You feel that you are as capable and as smart as most other people	1.7	1.7	1.7

[a]Degree of agreement expressed on a five-point scale running from "1" (strongly agree) to "5" (strongly disagree).

Summary

The characteristics of study subjects indicated that a number of circumstances and attitudes might play a part in the participation of dropouts in Federal Manpower Programs. The differences between sites and, occasionally, the difference between subjects who had never enrolled in Manpower Programs and those who had indicated that differential strategies would be required to overcome their impeding effects on participation in Manpower Programs. In addition to the characteristics reported in this chapter, the subjects' employment experiences constituted important variables conditioning the reach of Manpower Programs. The employment experiences of study subjects are reported in the next chapter.

V

Activities After Leaving School

This chapter reports the activities of study subjects since dropping out of school--their activities at the time of interview and in an 18-month period running from January, 1968, through June, 1969, their earliest and most recent jobs, and their occupational goals. Except for activities at the time of interview, which reflected both interviewed subjects and subjects for whom the interviewer was able to ascertain activity from other informants, all of the information in this chapter was derived from interviews.

Activities at the Time of Interview

Approximately eight out of ten interviewed subjects in both sites were in the civilian labor force at the time of interview, and significantly more of these subjects in St. Louis (29 percent, as compared with 19 percent in Baltimore) were unemployed and looking for work (see Table 59). Most of the uninterviewed subjects whose current activities could be determined were in the Armed Forces--88 percent in Baltimore, and 76 percent in St. Louis. Compared to Baltimore, very significantly more of the St. Louis uninterviewed subjects were reported to be in jail (18 percent, as compared with three percent in Baltimore). In Baltimore, on the other hand, comparatively more interviewed subjects were in jail, so that the portion of subjects in jail at the time of interview or attempted interview was the same in both sites (eight percent).

TABLE 59

ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW,
INTERVIEWED (I), AND UNINTERVIEWED (U), SUBJECTS

	Baltimore			St. Louis			Total		
	I N=176	U N=65	All N=241	I N=133	U N=71	All N=204	I N=309	U N=135	All N=445
	Percent			Percent			Percent		
In Civilian Labor Force									
Employed:									
Full-time[a]	55%	0%	40%	46%	0%	30%	51%	0%	35%
Part-time	5	0	3	5	0	3	5	0	3
Not Employed:									
Laid off	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Looking for work	19	0	14	29	0	19	23	0	16
Subtotal, civilian	81%	0%	58%	81%	0%	52%	80%	0	55%
Not in Civilian Labor Force									
In military service	1%	88%	24%	5%	76%	29%	3%	82%	27%
In school, training	2	2	2	6	3	5	4	1	3
Not working, not looking for work	5	0	3	5	0	3	5	0	3
In jail	10	3	8	2	18	8	7	11	8
Other, incld. sick	3	0	2	3	0	2	2	0	2
Deceased	0	8	2	0	3	1	0	5	2
Subtotal, not in civilian	21%	101%	41%	21%	100%	48%	21%	99%	45%
TOTAL	102%	101%	99%	102%	100%	99%	101%	99%	100%

[a]Employed 35 hours, or more, a week.

Baltimore's rate of indexed crime was about one and one-half times that of St. Louis in 1968 (see Table 60), with violent crimes being even more prevalent. It might, therefore, be speculated that the Baltimore environment was more conducive to criminal activities, and the need for alternate, socially productive activities correspondingly greater. Rates of crime reflect the incidence of crime, rather than criminals, however, and study results indicated that the latter were equally prevalent among dropouts in both sites and implied equal urgency in the need for activities related to productive employment.

TABLE 60

INDEX OF CRIME, 1968, IN BALTIMORE AND ST. LOUIS STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS[a]

	Baltimore	St. Louis
Population (thousands)	2,021.0	2,395.0
Total crime index (rate per 100,000)	4,449.2	2,899.6
Violent crime (rate per 100,000)	1,012.1	435.9
Property crime (rate per 100,000)	3,437.1	2,463.7

[a]Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1968, Table 5, p. 77 (Baltimore) and p. 87 (St. Louis).
Indexed crimes included murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny $50 and over, and auto theft. The latter three kinds of crime are considered property crimes.

At the time of interview, the activities of subjects who had never enrolled in out-of-school Federal Manpower programs were not substantially

different from those of enrollees (see Table 61).[1] Twenty-four percent of the Baltimore interviewed subjects who had never enrolled in Manpower Programs and 33 percent of the comparable St. Louis subjects were in the civilian labor force but either employed only part-time or not working at the time of interview.

TABLE 61

ACTIVITY AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SUBJECTS WHO HAD NEVER AND SUBJECTS WHO HAD EVER ENROLLED IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

	Baltimore		St. Louis		Total	
	Never	Ever	Never	Ever	Never	Ever
Activity	N=145	N=31	N=114	N=19	N=259	N=50
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
In Civilian Labor Force						
Employed full-time	56%	48%	47%	37%	52%	44%
Employed part-time	4	6	5	0	5	4
Not employed	20	29	28	31	24	30
Subtotal, civilian	80%	83%	80%	68%	81%	78%
Not in Civilian Labor Force						
In military service	1%	0%	4%	5%	3%	2%
In school or training program	1	6	5	11	3	8
In jail	10	10	2	5	7	8
Not working, not looking for work	6	0	4	11	5	4
Other, including sick	1	0	4	0	2	0
Subtotal, not civilian	19%	16%	19%	32%	20%	22%
TOTAL	99%	99%	99%	100%	101%	100%

[1]It should be borne in mind that study samples were not constituted to reflect the experience of enrollees and that inferences concerning the employment effectiveness of program enrollment cannot be drawn from these results.

Comparisons of civilian labor force status (see Table 62) in January, 1968, January, 1969, and at the time of interview (between July and November, 1969) showed that significantly more of the St. Louis subjects were outside the civilian labor market in January, 1968 (47 percent compared with 29 percent in Baltimore). The most important reason for this difference was the greater percentage of St. Louis subjects returning to full-time school (21 percent compared with four percent in Baltimore).

TABLE 62

CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE STATUS, TIME OF INTERVIEW, JANUARY 1, 1968, AND JANUARY 1, 1969

Time and Status	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
At time of interview			
Employed	60%	51%	56%
Not employed	22	29	25
Not in civilian labor force	19	21	21
January 1, 1969			
Employed	56%	45%	51%
Not employed	15	17	16
Not in civilian labor force	29	38	32
January 1, 1968			
Employed	58%	39%	50%
Not employed	12	14	13
Not in civilian labor force	29	47	37

The proportion of St. Louis subjects not in the civilian labor force drew even with the comparable proportion among Baltimore subjects by the time of interview when approximately the same proportions of subjects in the two sites were in the civilian labor force and approximately the same proportions of subjects were unemployed (22 percent in Baltimore and 29 percent in St. Louis).

Activities in the 18-Month Period, January, 1968 through June, 1969

In the 18 months just preceding the beginning of the interviewing period, Baltimore subjects averaged a little more than 10 months in employment, a little less than three months in unemployment, and nearly six months in activities outside of the civilian labor force (see Table 63). Among these latter activities, military service and being in jail took up the most time. Compared to Baltimore subjects, St. Louis subjects averaged somewhat less time in employment and somewhat more time outside the civilian labor force, with schooling taking up the most time.

In Baltimore, 74 percent of all subjects who had not participated in Federal Manpower Programs were continuously in the civilian labor force in the 18-month period; that is, they had spent no time in activities that might exclude employment (see Table 64). Somewhat fewer St. Louis non-enrollee subjects (67 percent) were continuously in the civilian labor force in the period. The amount of full-time employment reported by these subjects gave another indication of the comparatively better employment picture in Baltimore. Even in the relatively better employment environment of Baltimore, however, 33 percent of the subjects had been employed full-time no more than 9 months; and in St. Louis, full-time employment amounting to half, or less, of the 18 months was reported by 43 percent of the subjects.

TABLE 63

MEAN MONTHS IN ALL ACTIVITIES, 18-MONTH PERIOD
(JANUARY, 1968-JUNE, 1969)

Activities	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Mean Months	Mean Months	Mean Months
In Civilian Labor Force			
Employed:			
Employed full-time	9.6	7.5	8.7
Employed part-time	.6	.8	.7
Not employed:			
Laid off	.1	0.0	.1
Looking for work	2.5	3.1	2.6
Subtotal, civilian labor force	12.8	11.4	12.1
Not in Civilian Labor Force			
In military service	1.2	1.1	1.1
School or Training:			
In school full-time	.6	2.5	1.4
In school part-time	.2	.4	.3
In vocational training[a]	.9	.6	.8
Not looking for work	1.0	1.3	1.1
In jail	1.7	.7	1.3
Sick	.2	.1	.1
Other	0.0	.1	.1
Subtotal, not in civilian labor force	5.8	6.8	6.2
TOTAL[b]	18.6	18.3	18.3

[a]Vocational training included participation in city programs as well as in Federal Manpower programs (MDTA, Job Corps, NYC, New Careers).

[b]Months total more than 18 because some subjects involved in two or more activities simultaneously.

TABLE 64

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT, 18-MONTH PERIOD, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS CONTINUOUSLY IN CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE AND NEVER ENROLLED IN ANY OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAM[a]

Full-time Employment	Baltimore N=107	St. Louis N=76	Total N=183
	Percent	Percent	Percent
None	7%	12%	9%
1 through 3 months	6	12	8
4 through 6 months	7	8	7
7 through 9 months	13	11	12
10 through 12 months	10	9	10
13 through 15 months	5	11	7
16 through 18 months	52	38	46
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%

[a]Subjects who had ever enrolled in any program, or who had spent any time in activities outside the civilian labor force (school, training, military, or jail) were excluded.

Study results indicated, as many other studies have indicated[1], that unemployment problems were extensive and persistent among urban male dropouts. Civilian labor force status at several points in time, as well as the weight

[1]See, for example,
Vera C. Perrella, "Employment of high school graduates and dropouts," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 92, No. 6 (June, 1969) pp. 36-43. Perrella reported that 32.2 percent of 1968 male dropouts were unemployed (14.8 percent) or not in the labor force or in school (17.4 percent) in October, 1968. Her percentages were based on a sample representing the civilian non-institutional population, excluding persons in school, of 16-24 year olds. In the present study, a comparable percentage base would be 268, and 36 percent of these subjects were not working or not in the labor force or in school at the time of interview. Perrella's study included white and Negro males and described their status approximately 6 months to a year after dropout; whereas, in the present study, the status of Negro male dropouts only was reflected.

of various activities in the year and a half following the dropout year, indicated that neither the passage of time nor the non-labor force activities (including preparational activities for employment) materially improved the incidence of employment among study subjects. Other aspects of employment are investigated in the next several sections of this report.

Employment After Dropout

Very significantly fewer Baltimore subjects (8 percent) than St. Louis subjects (22 percent) reported no jobs since leaving school (see Table 65), and Baltimore subjects reported 2.9 jobs while St. Louis subjects reported 2.4 jobs.

TABLE 65

NUMBER OF JOBS SINCE LEAVING SCHOOL

Number of Jobs	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
None	8%	22%	14%
1-5	79	69	75
6-10	13	8	11
11-15	1	1	1
Total	101%	100%	101%
Mean number of jobs	2.9	2.4	2.7
Unknown (number)	(3)	(5)	(8)

Subjects were asked to give detailed information concerning their first jobs, and also--if they were no longer working in their first jobs--detailed information concerning their most recent jobs. Reports of when their first jobs began indicated that three-fourths of the Baltimore subjects and 38 percent of the St. Louis subjects, had first jobs in the dropout year, or before[1]. The interval between dropping out of school and beginning work was considerable in some cases, however, and 11 percent of the subjects reported no jobs at all between leaving school and the time of interview (see Table 66). Most of these subjects had not been in the labor market during this period.

TABLE 66

PREDOMINANT ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS REPORTING NO JOBS BETWEEN DATE OF DROPOUT AND DATE OF INTERVIEW

Activities	Baltimore and St. Louis N=32
	Percent
In Jail	25%
Returned to school	22
In military service	13
In training program	13
Not working, not looking for work	13
Not working, looking for work	13
TOTAL	99%

[1]Some subjects were already working at the time of dropout.

These results indicated that, although many subjects did not go directly into the labor force; once begun, job hunting met with a measure of success. With respect to the subjects who had had no jobs since leaving school, it was of interest that interviewers noted in the Interviewer's Impressions section of the interview schedule that each of these subjects appeared to be mentally retarded.

The first jobs reported by Baltimore subjects were similar to those reported by St. Louis subjects in several respects: about half were in unskilled labor or food preparation or service; about nine out of ten were full-time; they were liked to the same degree (an average rating of 3.2 on a scale of five), and nearly nine out of ten were no longer held at the time of interview (see Table 67). Compared to St. Louis first jobs, Baltimore first jobs paid considerably less well on the average ($1.72 per hour as compared with $2.04 per hour in St. Louis). These hourly rates were the highest earned on the job and thus might reflect rates of pay above entry-level. Baltimore subjects averaged about a month longer in their first jobs, however, so it is probable that the difference in rates of pay reflects generally higher rates of pay in St. Louis.[1]

[1]This interpretation is consistent with the higher hourly rates of pay reported for manufacturing production employees in St. Louis in 1969 (see Table 3).

TABLE 67

THE FIRST JOB, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS[a]

Characteristics	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Kind of Work			
Clerical, data processing	12%	8%	10%
Sales	1	2	2
Subprofessional, aide, technician	5	1	4
Crafts or trades[b]	5	11	7
Machine operator	6	13	9
Factory work	10	6	9
Food preparation or service	19	23	20
Miscellaneous and unskilled	42	37	40
TOTAL	100%	101%	101%
No job since leaving school (number)	(13)	(28)	(41)
Full-time employment (percent)	94%	88%	92%
Mean highest hourly earnings (amount)	$1.72	$2.04	$1.84
Mean months in job	8.2	6.9	7.7
Like-work rating (mean)[c]	3.2	3.2	3.2
No longer have job (percent)	86%	84%	86%

[a]Means and percentages based on number reporting.

[b]Includes apprentice jobs.

[c]Based on a five-point scale running from "hated it" (1) to "liked it very much" (5).

Subjects were asked to rate their liking for the job on a five-point scale running from "hated it" (1) to "liked it very much" (5), and to tell why they had rated the job as they did. Although, on the average, subjects rated

their liking for their first jobs above the midpoint of the scale, their "reasons" gave slightly more weight to negative than to positive aspects of the experience (see Table 68). About two-fifths of the subjects specified only negative aspects of the job, and nearly one-fifth gave "pro and con" responses (for example: "Work was hard but I needed the money," "Had its good and bad points," and "Didn't like it--didn't hate it"). The rationales

TABLE 68

REASONS FOR LIKE-WORK RATING, FIRST JOB

Reasons	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Negative expressions			
Working conditions	16%	5%	11%
Character of work	21	21	21
Lack of future	1	6	3
Other (including reiterated dislike)	3	5	4
Pro and Con	12	22	16
Positive expressions			
Working conditions	12	8	11
Character of work	29	29	29
Career potential	3	1	2
Other (including reiterated liking)	3	3	3
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Not reporting (number)[a]	(22)	(33)	(55)

[a]Includes "Not Applicable" (no first job), 41 subjects and "No Report" (missing observations), 14 subjects.

for like-work ratings emphasized specific aspects of work experience, and the career potential of the first jobs was given as the basis for very few ratings.

Three-fifths of the subjects reported that they had heard about their first jobs after leaving school through "friends" or "family" (see Table 69). The latter classification included adult relatives or friends of the family including such adult "social" contacts as parish priests and precinct workers. The most frequently reported other single category was "own efforts"-- a category that might have actually reflected other informational channels (such as friends or advertisements) but which did not specify them. Institutional sources of information (school, neighborhood centers, training programs, or the Employment Service) were infrequently reported as categories; but, together, they were reported by 18 percent of the subjects.

Most frequently, study subjects had quit their first jobs (see Table 70). In tabulating quitting reasons, an effort was made to distinguish between "job" reasons (for example, "dissatisfied with pay") and "personal" reasons (for example, "didn't get along with the supervisor"). Most of the job quits were associated with job reasons, and the two kinds of "quits" accounted for more than half of the job departures. Of next importance was "job ended," which accounted for 17 percent of the departures, and about 10 percent of the subjects reported that they had been fired.

TABLE 69

HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT FIRST JOB

How Heard	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Friends	42%	28%	37%
Family, family friends	18	27	22
School	1	4	2
Neighborhood Center	4	7	5
Training program (NYC, OIC, etc.)	5	6	5
Employment Service	3	11	6
Private employment agency	1	0	1
Previous employer	0	2	1
Ads or announcements	8	4	6
Own efforts	13	10	15
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%
Not reporting (number)[a]	(21)	(34)	(55)

[a]Included "Not Applicable" (no first job), 44 subjects, and "No Report" (missing observations), 11 subjects.

TABLE 70

MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE FIRST JOB

Reason	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
The job ended	17%	16%	17%
Was fired	10	8	9
Quit, dissatisfied with the job	39	33	36
Quit, personal reasons	17	20	18
Entered military service	3	4	3
School or training	7	8	7
Was jailed	4	8	5
Moved	1	0	0
Health	2	5	3
TOTAL	100%	102%	98%
Not reporting (number)[a]	(44)	(53)	(97)

[a]Includes "Not Applicable" (no first job, still have first job), 83 subjects, and "No Report" (missing observations), 14 subjects.

Compared to the first jobs, the current or most recent jobs of subjects at the time of interview indicated occupational mobility from poorer to better jobs (see Table 71). Food preparation and service jobs--20 percent of the first jobs--accounted for only 9 percent of the current or most recent jobs, and the frequency of factory jobs nearly doubled--from 9 percent to 17 percent. The average hourly rate of pay was up more than 30 cents, with St. Louis continuing to show higher rates of pay, and the average liking for

the job increased to 3.7. As in their first jobs, Baltimore subjects averaged more months in the job, although the composite total average was about the same for both the first job (7.7 months) and the current or most recent job (7.6 months).

TABLE 71

CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS[a]

Characteristics	Baltimore N=154	St. Louis N=99	Total N=253
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Kind of work			
Clerical, data processing	9%	7%	8%
Sales	2	2	2
Sub-professional, aide, technician	6	1	4
Crafts, trades[b]	8	17	12
Machine operator	8	12	10
Factory work	15	19	17
Food preparation and service	8	11	9
Miscellaneous and unskilled	45	30	39
TOTAL	101%	99%	101%
No job since leaving school (number)	(13)	(28)	(41)
Unknown (number)	(9)	(6)	(15)
Full-time employment (percent)	96%	96%	96%
Mean highest hourly earnings (amount)	$2.09	$2.33	$2.19
Mean months in job	9.0	5.6	7.6
Mean like-work rating[c]	3.8	3.6	3.7
No longer have job (percent)	36%	44%	39%

[a]Means and percentages based on number reporting.

[b]Includes apprentice jobs

[c]Based on a five-point scale running from "hated it" (1) to "liked it very much" (5).

Reasons for like-work ratings echoed the increased liking for work, with 65 percent of all subjects expressing positive, and generally specific, liking for their most recent jobs (see Table 72). As with the rationales for their earlier like-work ratings, subjects largely ignored the career aspects of their jobs in describing why they liked, or didn't like, their work.

TABLE 72

REASONS FOR LIKE-WORK RATING, CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB

Reasons	Baltimore N=154	St. Louis N=99	Total N=253
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Negative expressions			
Working conditions	11%	2%	7%
Character of work	11	15	13
Lack of future	1	3	2
Other (including reiterated dislike)	2	1	2
Pro and Con	9	17	12
Positive expressions			
Working conditions	26	14	22
Character of work	35	39	36
Career potential	5	4	5
Other (including reiterated liking)	0	4	2
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(1)	(3)

Social contacts continued to be the major source of information, 53 percent of all subjects reporting that they had heard about their most recent jobs through friends or family (see Table 73). Reasons for leaving most recent jobs, also, were similar to those given in connection with first job departures (see Table 74). The most frequently reported reasons were "quit"--33 percent because of dissatisfactions with the job, and 18 percent for personal reasons--and "job ended" (13 percent).

TABLE 73

HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB

Heard about through	Baltimore N=154	St. Louis N=99	Total N=253
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Friends	34%	32%	33%
Family, family friends	20	20	20
Training Program (NYC, OIC, etc.)	5	6	5
Employment Service	7	10	8
Private employment agency	3	0	2
School	1	4	2
Neighborhood Center	5	9	6
Previous employer	0	3	1
Ads or announcements	12	2	8
Own efforts	14	13	14
TOTAL	101%	99%	99%

TABLE 74

MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE MOST RECENT JOB

Main Reason	Baltimore N=154	St. Louis N=99	Total N=253
	Percent	Percent	Percent
The job ended	18%	19%	18%
Was fired	15	12	13
Quit, dissatisfied with job	33	33	33
Quit, personal reasons	15	23	18
Entered military service	5	2	4
School or training	4	5	4
Was jailed	9	2	6
Health	2	5	3
TOTAL	101%	101%	99%
Not reporting (number)[a]	(99)	(56)	(155)

[a]Includes "Not Applicable" (no most recent job other than first, still have most recent job, no job), 147 subjects, and "No Report" (missing observations), 8 subjects.

Maladjustment to the job, from the employer's point of view, was also reported by 13 percent of the subjects who were fired from their most recent jobs.

Occupational Goals

In answer to the question, "What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?" subjects tended to concentrate their responses in two occupational categories: entrepreneur or professional, and skilled manual crafts, trades, or technicians (see Table 75). In view of the backgrounds and experience of the subjects, it seems likely that an element of fantasy may have been involved in goals of being self-employed or a member of a professional, or semi-professional, group. To the extent that fantasy was involved, these high occupational goals could be expected to reflect discontent with blue-collar work rather than realistic aspirations that might motivate a youth to improve his occupational qualifications.

TABLE 75

WHAT KIND OF WORK WOULD YOU REALLY LIKE TO BE DOING 10 YEARS FROM NOW?

Kind of Work	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Entrepreneur, Professional, and Semi-Professional	31%	35%	33%
Executives, Managers, and Supervisor	6	6	6
Office clerical and Data processing	9	10	9
Other clerical and sales	2	4	3
Health, welfare, social service, and technicians	1	2	2
Crafts, trades, other technicians	32	27	30
Machine operator	7	2	5
Factory work and semi-skilled	3	2	3
Other and unskilled	3	4	3
Unspecific	6	6	6
TOTAL	100%	98%	100%
Unknown (number)	(16)	(5)	(21)

When occupational goal information was being coded, coders reviewed the descriptions of the subject's current or most recent job and evaluated the goal in terms if its possible relation to occupation experience (see Table 76). More than three-fourths of the subjects' occupational goals were apparently unrelated to work experience. About one-fourth of the subjects, on the other hand, seemed to have found their occupational roles: 15 percent looked forward to the same kind of employment, and 8 percent looked forward to advancing to higher career levels in work that they had experienced.

TABLE 76

CODER'S COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB

Comparison	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
The same ("about what I'm doing now")	17%	12%	15%
Advance ("a supervisor in the store I work in now")	10	5	8
Different	74	82	77
TOTAL	101%	99%	100%
Unknown (description of goal and/or most recent job missing) (number)	(73)	(60)	(133)

Thirty percent of the subjects thought that their chances of achieving their ten-year occupational goals were "very good" (see Table 77), and 43 percent thought their chances were "fairly good." A little more than half of the subjects backed up an optimistic estimate of goal achievement by reporting that they saw "nothing" that would hold them back (see Table 78). Lack of education or training was identified as the principal possible impediment to goal achievement--38 percent of the subjects reporting this, as compared to 10 percent for all other impediments (discrimination, health, police or employment record, etc.). These data, together with the data describing occupational goals, indicated that many of the subjects needed and could profit from programs that upgraded their vocational skills. Many other subjects, on the other hand, probably needed to fix on realistic occupational goals before such training could be optimally effective.

TABLE 77

SUBJECTS' ESTIMATE OF CHANCES OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Chances of Achieving Occupational Goal	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Very good	33%	26%	30%
Fairly good	33	55	43
Not so good	19	8	14
Unlikely	15	11	13
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(26)	(14)	(40)

TABLE 78

IS THERE ANYTHING THAT MIGHT HOLD YOU BACK FROM ACHIEVING OCCUPATIONAL GOAL?

Impediments	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
"Nothing holding me back"	42%	63%	51%
Lack of education or training	42	33	38
Discrimination	2	1	1
Health	2	0	1
Police record	6	2	4
Employment record	1	0	0
"Myself"	1	1	1
Entrance tests	1	0	0
Miscellaneous (military service, hate to get up in the morning)	3	2	3
TOTAL	100%	102%	99%
Unknown (number)	(27)	(13)	(40)

Compared to subjects who had never enrolled in Federal out-of-school Manpower Programs, enrollee subjects were slightly more apt to report ten-year occupational goals at the skilled manual level or above (see Table 79). Enrollee subjects were significantly less apt to report goals unrelated to their most recent work experience, were significantly more pessimistic about their chances of goal achievement, and were significantly more apt to report that lack of education or training might hold them back. These results are not inconsistent with the view that occupational aspiration and realization of preparational deficiency are both prerequisite to participation in training programs.

TABLE 79

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS,[a] OCCUPATIONAL GOALS
BY ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL OUT-OF-SCHOOL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Characteristics	Never Enrolled N=259	Ever Enrolled N=50	Total N=309
Goals in skilled manual work, or above (percent)	81%	89%	33%
Occupational goal unrelated to work experience (percent)	93%	74%	77%
Chance of achieving occupational goal (mean)[b]	2.0	2.4	2.1
Lack of education or training might hold back (percent)	35%	51%	38%

[a]Means and percentages based on number reporting.

[b]Based on a four-point scale running from "very good" (1) to "unlikely" (4).

Lowest Acceptable Salary

Subjects were asked whether, when they were looking for a job, they had a minimum acceptable rate of pay. In Baltimore, subjects reported an average minimum of $1.92 per hour and in St. Louis, $2.13 an hour. The distribution of the responses from these two sites is reported in Table 80.

TABLE 80

LOWEST ACCEPTABLE SALARY

Category	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Less than $1.39	5%	2%	4%
$1.40-$1.74	29	23	26
$1.75-$1.99	20	12	16
$2.00-$2.49	30	33	31
$2.50-$2.99	11	19	15
$3.00-$3.49	4	10	7
Over $3.50	1	2	1
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(5)	(7)
Lowest acceptable salary (mean)	$1.92	$2.14	$2.01

It is noteworthy that in both cities virtually all of the subjects wanted more than $1.40 per hour, the rate paid by the Baltimore NYC program. It seems apparent that for most of these youth, manpower programs cannot use financial incentives for participation without raising the rate to $2.00 or more. This suggests that the major inducement offered by these programs must be vocational opportunities and training rather than money alone. Since the interviewing was conducted a little over two years, on the average, after the subjects dropped out of school, it is probable that a lower rate might have appeared attractive shortly after leaving school.

Summary

While most of the interviewed subjects were in the labor force, a high proportion were either unemployed or working only part-time, thus indicating a widespread need for manpower programs. Further evidence of this need is provided by: the small proportion of their time spent in school training programs; the large number who left jobs because of dissatisfaction, personal reasons or being fired; and the wide discrepancy between the respondents' occupational goals and their current jobs. In the next chapter, barriers to participation in Federal Manpower Programs will be explored by examining the quality of information about these programs, the respondents' impressions of them and the degree to which they use them.

VI

Knowledge and Attitudes Concerning State Employment Service and Federal Manpower Programs

Dropouts' perceptions of the manpower services were explored through a number of questions concerning, in turn, the State Employment Service, Youth Opportunity Centers, the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, MDTA training programs, and New Careers. Each section of this part of the interview began with the question, "Have you ever heard of . . .?", and subsequent questions concerning the subjects' experiences with and views of the program in question were directed only to those subjects who said that they had heard of the program.

Subjects who had heard of a program were next asked whether, if they wanted to use the program, they would know where to go; and then the interviewer asked the subject to "tell me a little about what it (the program) does and who it's for." Responses to this query were the bases for interviewers' ratings of level of information: "knows quite a bit about it" (high); "knows only a little bit about it" (slight); or "confused, unclear, or no knowledge." Questions were then directed toward the subjects' experience with and impressions of the various programs.

Two open-ended questions--"What is there about it (the service or program) that might make a person want to use it?" and "What is there about it that might make a person <u>not</u> want to use it?" produced impressions of the various services and programs. Responses to these questions were tabulated to reflect as closely as possible the subjects' ideas, and tabulation categories have been described with illustrative quotations from subjects' responses.

State Employment Service

Most of the interviewed subjects in both sites (86 percent in Baltimore and 88 percent in St. Louis) reported that they had heard of their State Employment Service (see Table 81).[1] Compared to Baltimore, very significantly more of the St. Louis subjects (77 percent, as compared with 62 percent) knew where to register with the SES, and very significantly more (47 percent, as compared with 32 percent) had actually registered with the Employment Service. In both sites, very significantly more subjects knew where to register than actually had registered with the SES. The inhibiting factor in SES utilization for these subjects was probably a function of the subjects' perceptions of the relevance of the SES to their employment needs. It was of interest that interviewers considered only about one-fourth of the subjects in both sites to know "quite a bit" about the SES--a proportion considerably smaller than the proportion of SES registrants (about one-third in Baltimore, and about one-half in St. Louis).

[1]It should be kept in mind that subjects whose participation in Federal Manpower programs could be confirmed were eliminated prior to interviewing. The information level of such subjects with respect to the State Employment Service, Youth Opportunity Centers, and Federal Manpower programs can be expected to be higher than for non-participants.

TABLE 81

SELECTED VARIABLES, STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Variables	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Had heard of SES	86%	88%	87%
If wanted to register, would know where	62	77	69
Had registered at SES	32	47	38
High information level concerning SES	24	26	25
Had never heard of SES	14	12	13

Among subjects who had registered with the SES (see Table 82), approximately the same percentages of subjects in both sites reported having gotten a job through the SES (35 percent), having been referred to a Manpower Program (10 percent), having been tested or counseled (26 percent), and "nothing happened" (27 percent). Approximately half of the registrant subjects in both sites reported effective job referrals or referrals to organizations serving youth (training programs or, in Baltimore, the Youth Opportunity Center).

TABLE 82

STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACTIONS,
ALL SUBJECTS REGISTERED IN SES

SES Actions	Baltimore N=55	St. Louis N=62	Total N=117
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Referrals			
To employers:			
Got job	33%	37%	35%
Did not get job	9	24	17
To Federal Manpower Programs:			
NYC	0	3	2
Job Corps	2	2	2
MDTA	5	6	6
To YOC	11	0	5
Subtotal, referrals	60%	72%	67%
Other			
Tested	13%	15%	14%
Counseled	15	10	12
Helped prepare for job interview	11	2	6
Unemployment compensation	2	0	1
Subtotal, other	41%	27%	33%
Nothing happened	29%	27%	27%
TOTAL[a]	130%	126%	127%

[a]More than one action could be reported.

Two questions elicited impressions concerning the SES: "What is there about it that might make a person want to use it?" and "What is there about it that might make a person not want to use it?" Positive impressions concerning the program generally were produced by the first question, except that some subjects reported that there was "no reason" why a person might want to use

the program (thus responding negatively to the first question); and some subjects reported that there was "no reason" why a person might not want to use the program (thus responding positively to the second question).

More than half of the subjects who had heard of the SES (52 percent in Baltimore and 71 percent in St. Louis) reported that a person might want to use the service as an effective way of getting a job (see Table 83); and an additional 10 percent of the subjects, on the average, reported that the staff quality of the SES was a plus factor. All told, 68 percent of the Baltimore subjects, and 76 percent of the St. Louis subjects, thus endorsed the effectiveness and quality of SES activities. On the other hand, about one-fifth of the subjects in both sites either expressed reservations, criticism, or failed to report any reason why a person might want to use the SES.

Reports of sources of information probably represented the subjects' ideas of valid and probable sources of information to some extent--that is, a subject's report that he had heard about the SES from friends did not exclude knowing about the SES from other sources such as public announcements. Multiple sources of information were rarely reported, however, so that the dropout's marked tendency to report his own social networks as information sources connoted exclusion of institutional sources of information either absolutely (actually never heard of SES except through friends) or qualitatively (placed credence primarily in what was heard of SES through friends).

TABLE 83

IMPRESSIONS OF THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, PART 1
ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF THE SES

What is there about SES that might make a person want to use it?	Baltimore N=151	St. Louis N=117	Total N=268
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Convenience, location	1%	1%	1%
Referral effectiveness "Quickness of finding you a job," "if you really want a job, they can give you one	52	71	60
SES service "No charge for finding you a hustle, "fair in dealings," "Feels as though they really want you to have a job"	16	5	11
Quality of jobs "They give you good jobs," "jobs you have some interest in"	9	2	6
Reservations "You suppose be able to get a job quick," "they have good jobs for some people," "if you qualify, they might help you"	2	3	2
"No reason" (critical of SES)	2	5	3
None of above Get working permit, unemployment compensation· "helps dropouts," "a place for white people and not the Negro," "job training"	5	3	4
No response	14	10	12
TOTAL	101%	100%	99%

Private sources of information--the subjects' friends, families, or family friends--were most often reported in answer to the question, "How did you hear about the State Employment Service?" (see Table 84). Significantly more St. Louis (15 percent) than Baltimore subjects (5 percent) reported having heard through their schools or neighborhood centers. Institutional personnel informing subjects of the SES played a minor role in both sites, however, and the major public source of information concerning the SES was impersonal general announcement. Subjects often reported public announcement together with other sources of information and, in such cases, the other sources of information were tabulated. The frequencies for public announcement thus reflected reports of such announcements as the sole source of information.

TABLE 84

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT SES, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF SES

Sources of Information	Baltimore N=151	St. Louis N=117	Total N=268
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Private			
Friends	39%	43%	41%
Family, family friends	35	25	31
Public			
YOC	2	0	1
School	2	8	5
Neighborhood Center	3	7	5
Ads & announcements	15	16	15
Other public, including public and private	4	1	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(2)	(5)

Turning to considerations that might make a person not want to use the SES (see Table 85), approximately half of the subjects either stated that there was "no reason" or failed to give any reason that might inhibit the use of the SES. In addition, about 10 percent of the subjects reported that "the person himself" might be a reason for not using the SES because he might not want to work, or might not need to use the SES. Approximately one-third of the subjects reported specific defects in the SES that might make a person not want to use it--slowness, undesirability of jobs, and the quality of SES personnel.

Hard-and-fast conclusions cannot easily be drawn from the unstructured responses to these questions; but, considered together, subjects' responses on plus and minus factors in the SES provide some indication of the image of the SES that might--in view of the fact that most users hear of the SES through friends--influence the use of the SES. Putting together the two sides of SES impressions, it can be concluded that reports of the SES would include specific mentions of good features in about two-thirds of the cases and specific mentions of bad features in about one-third of the cases. The good reports might be premised on the idea that the inquirer really wanted a job and was, perhaps, more interested in employment, as such, than in a specific kind of work. The bad reports might "turn off" would-be users of the service.

TABLE 85

IMPRESSIONS OF THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, PART 2
ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF SES

What is there about the SES that might make a person not want to use it?	Baltimore N=151	St. Louis N=117	Total N=268
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Location, lack of information	5%	1%	3%
The person himself "If they don't want a job," "just plain lazy," "lack of education"	12	8	10
SES Service--slowness "Too damn slow," "you have to keep going back," "they keep you waiting all day," "nothing, unless they don't like sitting and standing around all day"	13	17	15
SES Service--Other "Seems like they is trying to find out what you can't do," "too many phoney people," "refer young people to other agencies," "white personnel are prejudiced"	3	9	6
Quality of jobs "Try to put you on a job you don't want or has low pay," "never offers anything important," "it's better to go out an look for a job on your own"	15	12	13
"No reason" (supportive of SES)	11	15	13
None of above "They take money out of your paycheck," "they might make you go to work," "everything"	5	3	4
No response	36	35	36
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

Youth Opportunity Center

Subjects in both sites reported about the same knowledge and utilization of YOC: About three-fourths had heard of the service, a little more than half knew its location, and about 2 out of 5 had registered with the YOC (see Table 86). As with information concerning the SES, the proportion of subjects who impressed their interviewers as knowing "quite a bit" about the service was substantially smaller than the proportion who reported registration.

TABLE 86

SELECTED VARIABLES, YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTER

Variables	Baltimore N=176	St. Louis N=133	Total N=309
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Had heard of YOC	74%	77%	76%
If wanted to register, would know where	56	53	54
Had registered, YOC	40	38	39
High information level concerning YOC	20	19	20
Had never heard of YOC	26	23	24

Although about the same percentages of subjects in both sites reported YOC registration (56 percent in Baltimore, and 53 percent in St. Louis), the proportion of YOC registrants who reported getting a job through YOC, or being referred to a training program through YOC, was significantly higher in Baltimore than in St. Louis (see Table 87). Compared to SES registrants in Baltimore, also, very significantly more Baltimore YOC registrants (70 percent) than Baltimore SES registrants (40 percent) reported getting a job or being referred to a training program.

TABLE 87

YOC ACTIONS, ALL SUBJECTS REGISTERED IN YOC

Actions	Baltimore N=70	St. Louis N=51	Total N=121
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Referrals			
To employers:			
Got a job	59%	45%	53%
Did not get a job	6	16	11
To training programs:			
NYC	3	0	2
Job Corps	0	4	2
OJT	1	0	1
MDTA	7	0	4
Subtotal, referrals	76%	65%	73%
Other			
Tested	17%	4%	12%
Counseled	26	16	21
Helped prepare for job interview	14	12	13
Subtotal, other	57%	32%	46%
Nothing happened	13%	25%	18%
TOTAL[a]	146%	122%	137%

[a]More than one action could be reported.

Most of the subjects in both sites (63 percent in Baltimore, and 68 percent in St. Louis) reported having heard about the YOC through their own friends or through their family and family friends (see Table 88).

TABLE 88

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT YOC, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC

Sources	Baltimore N=131	St. Louis N=103	Total N=234
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Private			
Friends	44%	60%	51%
Family, family friends	19	8	15
Public			
School	6	10	8
Neighborhood Center	2	7	4
Ads, announcement only	20	10	16
Public and private	8	5	7
TOTAL	99%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(3)	(5)

Most of the subjects who had heard of YOC found something good to say about it in response to the question, "What might make a person want to use it?" (see Table 89). YOC functions--youth specialization and referrals to jobs or training--came through clearly in most of the responses to this question. At the same time, a few subjects suggested here that a person might not want to use YOC, expressing reservations about the service or saying that there was "no reason" a person would want to use it (4 percent of all subjects), and 15 percent of the subjects found nothing to say. Some subjects, also (10 percent of all subjects who had heard of YOC), indicated that they had confused the YOC with a work training program.

TABLE 89

IMPRESSIONS OF YOC, PART 1, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC

What is there about the YOC that might make a person want to use it?	Baltimore N=131	St. Louis N=103	Total N=234
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Referral effectiveness "It helps people get jobs," "to get into training programs," "friends had gotten job at YOC"	24%	54%	38%
Youth specialization "Help young teenagers who are out of school to find employment, "helps find summer employment," "they have a lot of suggestions about training, jobs, and going back to school"	21	11	16
YOC service "They can get you a job if the ES can't," "they really try their best to help people and give them good jobs"	16	7	12
Quality of jobs "They get you a good job	7	1	4
Reservations "They really help a person find work but the jobs aren't that good," "they do find jobs if you are patient," "they get you pretty nice jobs sometimes"	5	2	3
None of the above "Helps train you to do some kind of work," "start you off at a reasonable salary for 4 days' work," "gets jobs for students who have families who can't afford to send their kids to school"	14	5	10
"No reason"	1	2	1
No report	13	18	15
TOTAL	101%	100%	99%

The generally good impression of YOC on study subjects was also indicated by responses to the question, "What might make a person not want to use YOC?" (see Table 90). Two-thirds of all subjects who had heard about YOC gave no indication that they thought there was anything about YOC that would prevent its use: 45 percent gave no response, 12 percent said there was "no reason" not to want to use it, and 9 percent indicated that "the person himself" (rather than YOC) might be a disqualifying factor. The most frequently reported inhibiting aspect of YOC was the kind of jobs a person might get through the service.

Considering the responses to both questions, the impression made by YOC in St. Louis was better in several respects than that in Baltimore. Although about the same proportions of subjects remarked on YOC's service in referring youths to jobs or training (73 percent in St. Louis, and 68 percent in Baltimore), comparatively more Baltimore subjects specified defects in YOC service (38 percent, as compared with 28 percent), and comparatively more Baltimore subjects' responses connoted some misconception of YOC functions (16 percent, as compared with 6 percent).

TABLE 90

IMPRESSIONS OF YOC, PART 2, ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF YOC

What is there about YOC that might make a person not want to use it?	Baltimore N=131	St. Louis N=103	Total N=234
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Location, lack of information	1%	0%	0%
The person himself An older person would not want to use it because of the salary," "if a person didn't like suggestions about training, jobs, and going back to school," "if you don't want the Job Corps," "if he wants to be a thug and hang in the streets"	8	10	9
YOC service--slowness "Have to keep coming back," "a lot of kids don't have the time"	7	11	9
YOC service--other "The way they treat people," "they don't be doing nothing for you," "don't show enough concern," "ask too many questions"	4	4	4
Quality of jobs "A person maybe can find a better job by going to the company and in less time," "send you beyond the city limits when there are jobs in the city," "might not be the job you want"	27	13	21
None of above "Only for students," "if he doesn't want training," "they don't get summer jobs"	2	1	1
"No reason"	14	9	12
No report	38	53	45
TOTAL	101%	101%	101%

Summary, SES and YOC

In all, 17 percent of the study subjects reported ever having gotten a job or been referred to a training program through the SES, and 26 percent reported ever having gotten a job or been referred to a training program through YOC. Barriers to the utilization of these services included lack of information and impressions of the services that might be expected to "turn off" would-be users. Since "friends" were a very important source of information, the fact that about 50 percent of all study subjects expressed reservations, misconceptions, or specific criticisms of the SES and the YOC could be expected to restrict the reach of these services. Good reports of the SES and the YOC, it is true, outnumbered bad reports and were undoubtedly instrumental in getting some subjects to the SES and the YOC.

Federal Manpower Programs

Although this study was focused on young men who had not enrolled in out-of-school Federal Manpower Programs (the Out-of-School NYC, the Job Corps, MDTA programs, or New Careers), it proved unfeasible to eliminate all such youths prior to interview. Some youths were excluded at the outset because of their known participation in these programs, however, with the result that the subjects described in this section cannot be considered as "samples" of program populations. It is possible, furthermore, that the partial exclusion of participants in Manpower Programs minimized the reflection of dropouts with In-School NYC experience in the results. Although such subjects were not intentionally excluded, there were some indications that In-School

NYCers were more apt to enroll in Out-of-School Manpower Programs and thus were more apt to be excluded from the study. In all, 18 subjects reported In-School NYC enrollment, and 6 of these also reported enrollment in the Out-of-School Manpower Programs--a significantly higher percentage than that of subjects who had not enrolled in the In-School NYC.

In the original sample, 76 subjects were found, prior to interviewing, to have participated in manpower programs (47 in Baltimore and 29 in St. Louis). Manpower program participation for 50 additional subjects was determined through interviewing. In total, 19 percent of the original sample plus replacements participated in Federal Manpower Programs. A greater percentage of Baltimore subjects participated in the Job Corps (16 percent, as compared to 5 percent in St. Louis), and more St. Louis subjects participated in the NYC (9 percent, as compared to 4 percent in Baltimore). (See Table 91)

TABLE 91

PARTICIPATION OF TOTAL SAMPLE IN
FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE

Program Participation Determined	Baltimore N	Baltimore %	St. Louis N	St. Louis %	Total N	Total %
Job Corps						
Prior to interview	42	12%	3	1%	45	7%
Through interview	15	4	12	4	27	4
Total	57	16%	15	5%	72	11%
Out-of-School NYC						
Prior to interview	6	2%	28	9%	34	5%
Through interview	7	2	2	1	9	1
Total	13	4%	30	10	43	6%
MDTA						
Prior to interview	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Through interview	7	2	3	1	10	2
Total	7	2%	3	1%	10	2%
Two or more programs	2	1%	2	1%	4	1%
Sub-total, Manpower Programs	79	23%	50	17%	129	20%
Non-Participants	145	42%	114	36%	259	39%
Military, not interviewed	57	16	54	17	111	17
Other, not determined	66	19	100	31	166	25
TOTAL SUBJECTS	347	100%	318	101%	665	101%

Information was systematically secured concerning five Federal Manpower programs: the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, MDTA training programs, and New Careers. Only nine subjects--5 in Baltimore and 4 in St. Louis--reported having heard of New Careers. None of these subjects had enrolled in New Careers, and 7 of the 9 had not thought of applying. The role of New Careers in the

activities of study subjects was thus negligible.

In both sites, by far the most widely known program was the Job Corps (see Table 92). Almost every study subject had heard of the Job Corps, and 9 percent of them had actually enrolled in the program. In Baltimore, approximately the same percentages of subjects reported having heard of the NYC and the MDTA (about 27 percent), and the same percentages of subjects reported enrollment in these programs (5 percent). In St. Louis, preliminary work in setting up the study had removed most Out-of-School NYC enrollees from the study group and only 2 percent of the St. Louis study subjects had any experience with the Out-of-School NYC. Twenty-eight percent of the St. Louis subjects had heard of the Out-of-School NYC, however--considerably fewer than had heard of the In-School NYC (45 percent) or the MDTA (43 percent).

Most of the subjects who had heard of the various programs had not considered applying to them. Lack of interest in the program thus constituted a second barrier to participation. In the widely-known Job Corps, lack of interest apparently cancelled much of the potential advantage of widespread recognition--even though, for example, three times as many subjects had heard about the Job Corps as the Out-of-School NYC, three times as many subjects were not personally interested in the Job Corps as were not personally interested in the Out-of-School NYC. The relatively smaller amount of real interest in the Job Corps was also evidenced by enrollments considered as a portion of all who thought of applying. About half of the subjects who reported considering the Out-of-School NYC and MDTA programs--those who thought about applying, those who applied and those who actually enrolled--actually enrolled in these programs, while only about one-third of the subjects who considered the Job Corps actually enrolled.

TABLE 92

SUBJECTS' RECOGNITION OF AND INTEREST IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE AND PROGRAM

Recognition and Interest	I/S NYC	O/S NYC	Job Corps	MDTA
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Baltimore (N=176)				
Heard of program				
Enrolled	6%	5%	9%	5%
Applied, but did not enroll	2	2	5	2
Thought about applying	2	2	22	3
Did not consider applying	20	17	61	17
Subtotal, heard of program	30%	26%	97%	27%
Never heard of program	70%	74%	3%	73%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis (N=133)				
Heard of program				
Enrolled	8%	2%	10%	4%
Applied, but did not enroll	2	3	6	2
Thought about applying	2	2	9	6
Did not consider applying	31	20	71	29
Subtotal, heard of program	43%	27%	96%	41%
Never heard of program	57%	73%	4%	59%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total (N=309)				
Heard of program				
Enrolled	6%	3%	9%	4%
Applied, but did not enroll	2	2	5	2
Thought about applying	2	2	17	5
Did not consider applying	25	20	65	22
Subtotal, heard of program	35%	27%	96%	33%
Never heard of program	65%	73%	4%	67%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

Between half and two-thirds of the subjects who had heard of the programs--depending on the program and the site--reported that they knew the program's location (see Table 93). In general, St. Louis subjects were more apt to know locations, with at least three-fifths of the subjects who had heard of each program knowing where it was and, in the case of Out-of-School NYC, four-fifths. The whereabouts of MDTA was most apt to be known in Baltimore (65%), and the locations of other programs were only slightly less apt to be known.

TABLE 93

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, EXPERIENCE IN AND KNOWLEDGE OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS BY SITE AND PROGRAM--ALL SUBJECTS WHO HAD HEARD OF PROGRAMS

Characteristics	I/S NYC	O/S NYC	Job Corps	MDTA
Baltimore				
Had heard of program (number)	(52)	(46)	(170)	(48)
If wanted to apply, would know where	56%	54%	57%	65%
Information level rated "high"	33%	28%	36%	21%
Enrolled in program	19%	20%	9%	17%
St. Louis				
Had heard of program (number)	(57)	(36)	(128)	(55)
If wanted to apply, would know where	63%	83%	63%	60%
Information level rated "high"	19%	19%	35%	25%
Enrolled in program	18%	8%	10%	9%
Total				
Had heard of program (number)	(109)	(82)	(298)	(103)
If wanted to apply, would know where	60%	67%	69%	62%
Information level rated "high"	26%	24%	34%	23%
Enrolled in program	18%	15%	10%	13%

The proportion of study subjects who had ever enrolled in Federal Manpower programs was very small (see Table 94) and enrollments rarely lasted for more than six months. Even through program experience was thus generally limited, it was of interest that most of the enrollees in the NYC and MDTA programs reported that their program experiences had helped them to get jobs, while the percentage of Job Corpsmen who reported that their experience had helped them to get jobs was lower.

TABLE 94

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Characteristics	I/S NYC	O/S NYC	Job Corps	MDTA
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Baltimore (N=176)				
Ever enrolled in program	6%	5%	9%	5%
St. Louis (N=133)				
Ever enrolled in program	8%	2%	10%	4%
Total (N=309)				
Ever enrolled in program	6%	4%	9%	4%
In program 6 months or less	5	1	7	4
Program helped subject get a job	5	3	4	3

Scurces of Information Concerning Federal Manpower Programs

The three most frequently mentioned sources of information concerning manpower programs were friends, school, and public announcements (see Table 95). Friends were most frequently mentioned in both sites for each program with the exception of the St. Louis In-School NYC. In this instance, friends were reported as the information source by 41 percent of the subjects who had heard of the program, and school, by 43 percent. In St. Louis, school was also an important information source for the Out-of-School NYC, being reported by 19 percent of the subjects who had heard of the Out-of-School NYC. In Baltimore, school was an important information source for the In-School NYC (22 percent), but was reported as a source by 7 percent, or less, of the subjects in connection with other programs.

Public announcements were fairly important sources of information in connection with all Baltimore programs, being reported as the sole source by from 13 percent to 27 percent of the subjects who had heard of the various programs. In St. Louis, public announcements were important information sources only for the Job Corps (30 percent) and the MDTA (17 percent).

In view of the relatively slight actual experience with Federal Manpower Programs reflected in the study, most of the impressions that subjects had of these programs were derived from the hearsay of their friends and from public announcements. Word-of-mouth information from informed personnel was a relatively minor information source with the exception of school sources in connection with the In-School NYC.

TABLE 95

HOW SUBJECTS HEARD ABOUT FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS
BY SITE AND PROGRAM

Site & Source of Information	I/S NYC	O/S NYC	Job Corps	MDTA
Baltimore				
Number who had heard of program	52	46	169	47
		Percent		
Heard about program through:				
Private sources				
Friends	39%	52%	41%	43%
Family, relatives, family friends	4	9	12	12
Public sources				
Employment Service, YOC	4	4	6	6
School	22	7	2	2
Neighborhood Center	6	9	4	6
Ads and announcements only	14	13	27	26
Public and private sources	12	4	8	4
TOTAL	101%	98%	100%	99%
St. Louis				
Number who had heard of program	56	36	128	54
		Percent		
Heard about program through:				
Private sources				
Friends	41%	44%	45%	46%
Family, relatives, family friends	4	3	7	9
Public sources				
Employment Service, YOC	0	11	9	9
School	43	19	2	7
Neighborhood Center	4	11	6	6
Ads, announcements only	4	8	30	17
Public and private sources	5	3	1	6
TOTAL	101%	99%	100%	100%
Total				
Number who had heard of program	107	82	297	101
		Percent		
Heard about program through:				
Private sources				
Friends	40%	49%	43%	45%
Family, relatives, family friends	4	6	10	11
Public sources				
Employment Service, YOC	2	9	7	8
School	33	12	2	5
Neighborhood Center	5	10	5	6
Ads, announcements only	8	11	28	21
Public and private sources	8	3	4	5
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	101%

Impressions of the In-School NYC

Less than one-tenth of the study subjects in both sites had ever been enrolled in the In-School NYC, but 30 percent of the Baltimore subjects and 43 percent of the St. Louis subjects reported that they had heard of the program. A little more than two-thirds of the subjects who had heard of the In-School NYC specified reasons why a person might want to enroll in the In-School NYC (see Table 96). The work itself--the pay, what enrollees did--was mentioned favorably in about half of the responses, while general career or educational opportunity was mentioned in the remainder of the reasons.

Turning to reports of what might make a person not want to enroll, nearly half of the subjects who had heard of the In-School NYC did not report any reason, another one-fifth specifically stated that there was "no reason", and 5 percent reported in this connection that something about the person--rather than the program--might produce this situation. All told, about three-fourths of the subjects passed up the opportunity to criticize the program provided by this part of the interview. Aspects of the program that might inhibit enrollment included poor pay, slow pay, part-time work, restriction to juniors and seniors (in St. Louis), interference with study, and lack of real career help

TABLE 96

IMPRESSIONS OF THE IN-SCHOOL NYC, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF PROGRAM, BY SITE

Impressions	Baltimore N=52	St. Louis N=57	Total N=109
	Percent	Percent	Percent
What might make a person want to enroll?			
Pay			
Earn lunch money, carfare, extra money	17%	19%	18%
Work and working conditions			
Jobs not hard, good jobs, only work 4 days and get paid for whole week	10	7	8
Educational opportunity			
Work and stay in school	19	19	19
Employment or career opportunity			
Helps you get other jobs, helps train for different jobs	23	19	21
Other			
Something to do, keep out of trouble	4	2	3
No reason (critical of NYC)	0	2	1
Not reporting	27	32	29
TOTAL, Want to enroll	100%	100%	99%
What might make a person not want to enroll?			
The person himself			
Not interested in self-betterment	8%	2%	5%
Pay			
They only pay $1.40 an hour, slow about paying	17	7	13
Work and working conditions			
Only allowed to work 26 hours a week, for juniors and seniors only, temporary work	0	7	4
Other			
Works too slow to get people right kind of job, takes too much time from study, might not get a job	8	12	10
No reason (endorsement of NYC)	23	19	21
Not reporting	44	51	48
TOTAL, Not want to enroll	100%	98%	101%

Impressions of the Out-of-School NYC

Compared to the In-School NYC, even fewer study subjects had ever been enrolled in the Out-of-School NYC (5 percent in Baltimore and 2 percent in St. Louis), and only 27 percent of the study subjects reported that they had ever heard of the program. About two-thirds of the subjects who had heard of the program reported reasons why a person might want to enroll in it, with the work itself and the opportunity that it represented receiving about equal mention (see Table 97). Some subjects (one-tenth of all subjects reporting) criticized the program at this point, saying sarcastically that a person might want to enroll "if you like low wages," or stating that there was "no reason" why a person would want to enroll. A few subjects, also (4 percent of all reporting) had evidently confused the program with the Job Corps in that they referred to "getting away from home" as a program feature.

Negative impressions of the program were reported by 38 percent of the Baltimore subjects and by 18 percent of the St. Louis subjects. All of these negative impressions implied consideration of the NYC as a job and emphasized the pay, work, working conditions, and program staff. Many subjects used this part of the interview to endorse the program or, at least, not knock it: 12 percent stating that there was "no reason" why a person might not want to enroll, and 10 percent noting that personal reasons extraneous to the program might be a factor. In addition, as with the In-School NYC, about half of the subjects did not say anything at this point.

TABLE 97

IMPRESSIONS OF THE OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF PROGRAM, BY SITE

Impressions	Baltimore N=46	St. Louis N=36	Total N=82
	Percent	Percent	Percent
What might make a person want to enroll?			
Pay			
An easy way to make a buck	2%	8%	5%
Work			
Jobs for people who can't find work, chance to work around young children	24	25	24
Career, personal development			
Could help you get started, training for a better job, place for young people who have dropped out of school to get help	33	25	29
NYC environment			
The people are nice and they get you pretty good jobs	4	6	5
Criticism of program			
No reason to enroll, if you can't get any thing better, if you like low wages	11	6	9
"No Reason"	3	0	1
Confusion			
Travel and get away from home	4	3	4
Not reporting	20	28	23
Total, want to enroll	101%	101%	100%
What might make a person not want to enroll?			
The person himself			
They don't want to work, they don't need it	.7%	14%	10%
Pay			
Salaries too low, they pay only every other week	20	8	15
Work			
The kind of work they send you to	7	0	4
NYC environment and conditions			
Personnel is not too cool, would rather work full-time, you have to wait too long	9	6	7
Career, personal development			
Only temporary jobs, not for future	2	3	2
"No Reason" (endorsement of NYC)	9	17	12
Confusion			
Travel and get away from home	2	3	2
Not reporting	46	50	48
TOTAL, Not want to enroll	102%	101%	100%

Impressions of the Job Corps

Although only 9 percent of the study subjects had ever enrolled in the Job Corps, almost everyone had heard of this program. The program feature of getting away from home was important to subjects' impressions--16 percent of the subjects who had heard of the program thinking that this might be a reason to enroll, and 30 percent, thinking that this might be a reason not to enroll (see Table 98).

Approximately four-fifths of the subjects who had heard of the Job Corps thought that a person might want to enroll in this program because of the vocational opportunity that it represented or because the Job Corps experience in itself was a good thing--the pay, the quality of the experience. One-fifth of the subjects, however, did not report any reason for joining the Job Corps or explicitly stated that there was "no reason" why a person might want to join.

The fact that the Job Corps was "for" disadvantaged youths was noted as a possible reason for not wanting to enroll in it. This aspect of the Job Corps, together with negative impressions of the Job Corps experience, accounted for all of the specified negative impressions other than those associated with leaving home. All told, 56 percent of all subjects who had heard of the Job Corps reported specific reasons why a person might not want to enroll in it. This was a much higher percentage than comparable percentages in the In-School NYC (32 percent) or the Out-of-School NYC (38 percent).

TABLE 98

IMPRESSIONS OF THE JOB CORPS, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF THE PROGRAM, BY SITE

Impressions	Baltimore N=169	St. Louis N=128	Total N=297
	Percent	Percent	Percent
What might make a person want to enroll?			
Getting and being away from home			
Some people like to travel, helps you get away from your friends and learn better, if you can't find anything else in the street and want to work	19%	13%	16%
Job Corps experience			
It's a pretty regular outfit, lot of fun, meet new people, clean place to sleep and work, can teach you things that school sometimes can't, gives you a new start	5	4	5
Career value, vocational opportunity			
They train you for a job to make some long bread, $50 a mouth and learn a trade, School dropouts can get a bette. job and training	59	57	58
Other			
Keep from being drafted	1	2	1
"No Reason" (critical of Job Corps)	0	6	3
Not reporting	16	18	17
TOTAL, want to enroll	100%	100%	100%
What might make a person not want to enroll?			
The person himself			
Pride--being embarassed, don't need it, don't like meeting new people	11%	2%	7%
Getting and being away from home			
Too far from home, might get homesick	29	31	30
Job Corps Experience			
Too much like school, have to wear JC clothes, no girls, fines, racial troubles, unqualified instructors, low pay, long hours, waiting period, just gives a nigger something to do, for people who can't get a job otherwise	19	20	19
"No Reason" (endorsement of Job Corps)	7	5	6
Not reporting	34	41	37
TOTAL, not want to enroll	100%	99%	99%

Impressions of the MDTA

Four percent of all study subjects had ever enrolled in an MDTA training program, and one-third of all subjects had ever heard of this program. In specifying why a person might want to get into an MDTA course, 53 percent of those who had heard of the program mentioned vocational opportunity, including the earn and learn features of MDTA (see Table 99). Slightly more than one-third of those who had heard of the MDTA did not give any reason why a person might want to join, and the rest gave "reasons" that suggested misconceptions of the program--for example, that it was "for" alcoholics, dropouts, or people who could get no other job, or that it was a substitute for regular school. One percent of the subjects said there was "no reason" why a person would want to use the MDTA.

As for reasons why a person might not want to use the MDTA, 56 percent of all subjects who had heard of the program did not respond, 13 percent said that there was "no reason" why a person wouldn't want to use the MDTA, and 8 percent noted that a person might not want it because he didn't need it or was ignorant of it. Specified drawbacks to the program were reported by 23 percent of the subjects who had heard of the program and who noted that, as a job, MDTA paid poorly; as vocational preparation, MDTA did not lead to good jobs; and, as an experience, MDTA involved classes and supervision.

TABLE 99

IMPRESSIONS OF THE MDTA, SUBJECTS WHO KNEW OF THE PROGRAM, BY SITE

Impressions	Baltimore N=47	St. Louis N=54	Total N=101
	Percent	Percent	Percent
What might make a person want to enroll?			
The person himself			
People who are alcoholics, who can't get other jobs, dropouts	8%	4%	6%
Earn, earn and learn			
Need a job, paid while learning a trade	15	11	13
General opportunity, vocational training			
Helps you advance; career handed down to you; if I didn't know how to do nothing, they would show me how	31	47	40
MDTA experience			
You only work a week or so, learn what you would have in regular school	6	2	4
"No Reason" (critical of program)	0	2	1
Not reporting	40	34	37
TOTAL, want to enroll	100%	100%	101%
What might make a person not want to enroll?			
The person himself			
Don't need it, want it, or know about it	9%	7%	8%
Pay, conditions			
Not a steady job, low pay, fines	17	13	14
MDTA experience			
Classes you have to go to, supervision, can't get the jobs you're skilled for, they don't have all the equipment	13	5	9
"No Reason" (endorsement of MDTA)	6	18	13
Not reporting	56	56	56
TOTAL, not want to enroll	101%	99%	100%

Summary

The extent and character of information concerning manpower services and programs obviously influenced the utilization of these agencies. The Employment Service, the Youth Opportunity Centers, and the Job Corps were widely-known in the sense that most subjects had heard of these agencies. Knowing an agency by name, however, was considerably more prevalent than having a practical knowledge of it--knowing where to go if one wanted to register, and knowing what it did. Finally, even though most of the subjects had never enrolled in any of the out-of-school Federal Manpower Programs, negative impressions had been formed that might prevent the subject from trying to utilize these programs.

Although 96 percent of the subjects who had never enrolled in any Federal Manpower program had heard of the Job Corps, only 51 percent knew where to go in order to apply, and only 27 percent impressed their interviewers as knowing "quite a bit" about the Corps (see Table 100). Forty-five percent of these subjects, nevertheless, expressed specific criticisms of this program.

With respect to the Out-of-School NYC and the MDTA, lack of information rather than the presence of negative impressions, appeared to be the major informational barriers to participation.

TABLE 100

INFORMATION RELATING TO OUT-OF-SCHOOL NYC, JOB CORPS, AND MDTA, SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS[a] BY ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Characteristics	Out-of-School NYC		Job Corps		MDTA	
	Never	Ever	Never	Ever	Never	Ever
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
Had heard of program	24%	40%	96%	100%	31%	48%
Had heard of program and:						
Knew location	15	34	51	98	17	38
Knew "quite a bit" about it	4	20	27	76	4	26
Specified negative impressions[b]	5	18	45	62	7	16

[a]Percentages based on Never Enrolled N-259, and Ever Enrolled N-50.

[b]Specific criticisms of service or program expressed in response to "What is there about (it) that might make a person not want to use it?"

VII

Variables Associated with Quality of Employment Outcomes

The relationship of many variables--inadequate education, lack of skill and work experience, unawareness of available training and job opportunities, and discrimination--to the labor market difficulties of Negro male school dropouts are well understood. Less is known, however, about the interaction among economic, sociological, and psychological characteristics that permit some individuals to make a satisfactory adjustment to the "world of work" while others do not. An understanding of the factors that influence work adjustment and the interactions among them should be useful in the development of policy measures designed to improve the work adjustment of Negro male youths. This chapter explores some of those relationships by reporting the results of analyses based on the quality of employment adjustments.

Categories of Employment Adjustment

For the purposes of analysis, subjects were categorized in six ranked kinds of adjustments to the world of work, and to society as follows:

1. Good adjustments to the world of work. This category included subjec who were employed full-time when interviewed, and who had been employed full-time at least 17 of the 18 months in the period January 1, 1968, through June 30, 1969.

2. Probable good adjustment to the world of work. This category includ subjects who were employed full-time at the time of interview and who had spent at least 15 of the 18 months in activities that were consistent with maintaining employment (employment, military service, school, or training).

3. Possible good adjustments to the world of work. In this category, the evidence was more tentative than in category 2. Subjects who were in military service, school, or training programs at the time of interview, or who had spent at least 15 months in these activities or employment in the 18-month period, qualified for the third category.

4. Fair to poor employment adjustments. This category was the residual remaining after the good adjustments (categories 1, 2, and 3) and the poor adjustments (categories 5 and 6) had been allocated.

5. Poor adjustments to society. This category included subjects who were in jail at the time of interview, or in jail during the 18-month period, except those whose employment records qualified them for categories 1, 2, or 3.

6. Poor adjustments to the world of work. This category included subjects who were unemployed at the time of interview, or who had been employed one month or less in their current jobs if employed when interviewed, and who had been unemployed nine months or more in the 18-month period.

About half of the interviewed subjects had achieved "good" adjustments to the world of work (see Table 101). As would be expected, comparatively more subjects who had ever enrolled in Federal Manpower Programs were in adjustment categories "2" and "3", their participation in such programs tending to reduce their time in the civilian labor force and their potential to achieve full employment required by category "1". Category "1" adjustments in this analysis did not foreclose subjects from consideration as possible clients for Federal

About half of the study subjects were in categories of "good" adjustment to the world of work, and about half were in categories of "poor" adjustment (see Table 101). Neither enrollment experience nor site (see Table 102) was associated with adjustment category. These results indicated that, more than two years after leaving school, about half of the study subjects were not making it in the world of work and were urgently in need of enhanced employability. Even though the study was not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of Federal Manpower programs, it was of interest that the very limited reflection of such program experience in the study pointed to the importance of achieving effective program participation as much as the need for enrollment in employability-enhancing programs.

TABLE 101

EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENTS BY SITE AND ENROLLMENT IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Adjustments[a]	Baltimore Never N=145	Baltimore Ever N=31	St. Louis Never N=114	St. Louis Ever N=19	Total Never N=259	Total Ever N=50	Grand Total N=309
	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent
Good							
1 Good	30%	19%	19%	5%	25%	14%	23%
2 Possibly Good-Employed	12	23	12	11	12	18	13
3 Possibly Good-Not in Civilian Labor Force	11	13	18	21	14	16	15
Subtotal, Good	53%	55%	49%	37%	51%	48%	51%
Poor							
4 Fair to poor	17%	19%	20%	32%	19%	24%	19%
5 Poor-Jail	16	19	11	11	14	16	14
6 Poor-Unemployed	14	6	18	21	16	12	16
Subtotal, Poor	47%	44%	49%	64%	49%	52%	49%
TOTAL	100%	99%	98%	101%	100%	100%	100%

[a]See pp. 146-147 for detailed description of adjustment categories.

TABLE 102

CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT, ENROLLMENT IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS, AND SITE

Categories	(Number)	Enrollment		Total[a]	Site		Total[a]
		Never	Ever		Baltimore	St. Louis	
Good							
1	(72)	90%	10%	100%	68%	32%	100%
2	(40)	78	22	100	60	40	100
3	(45)	82	18	100	44	55	99
Subtotal, Good	(157)	85%	15%	100%	59%	41%	100%
Poor							
4	(60)	80%	20%	100%	52%	48%	100%
5	(44)	82	18	100	66	34	100
6	(48)	88	13	101	48	52	100
Subtotal, Poor	(152)	83%	17%	100%	55%	45%	100%
TOTAL	(309)	84%	16%	100%	57%	43%	100%

[a]Row Totals.

Family Backgrounds and Employment Adjustment

Socio-economic characteristics in the family backgrounds of subjects in the various employment adjustment categories indicated that these variables were not consistently related to the quality of adjustments to the world of work (see Table 103). There was, for example, little difference between the highest and lowest categories in the percentage of subjects whose families received welfare assistance "all" or "most of the time" (20 percent and 23 percent, respectively); the percentage of subjects who grew up in "mother-only" families (28 percent and 23 percent, respectively); or the percentage of subjects with families in which the principal adult had completed nine school grades or less (50 percent and 47 percent, respectively). Similarly, hi-lo comparisons of percentages of subjects with families in which the principal adult's occupation was at or above the skilled manual level (22 percent and 27 percent, respectively) and of the percentages of subjects with families in which the principal adult was not working at the time of dropout (27 percent and 15 percent, respectively) indicated no association between these variables and the employment adjustments of study subjects.

TABLE 103

SELECTED SOCIO-ECONOMIC FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS
AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Characteristics	Categories of Employment Adjustment 1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
While growing up:						
Mother-only family	28%	28%	34%	33%	36%	23%
Welfare assistance all or most of time	20	13	26	22	16	23
Principal adult:[a]						
Completed 9th grade or less	50	48	35	54	49	47
Skilled manual laborer, or above[b]	22	27	25	28	21	29
No occupation[c]	17	8	21	16	7	9
Not working at time of dropout	27	15	33	24	14	15
Median family income, year before dropout (dollars)	4615	4643	3909	3923	3708	4038
Median size of household at time of dropout (number of persons)	6.3	6.1	6.4	6.7	5.9	6.9

[a]Principal adult was male head of household except in families that lacked male heads--principally "mother-only" families. In such cases, the mother was the principal adult.

[b]Included skilled manual labor, Technicians and Self-Employed, Clerical and Sales, Professionals, Semi-Professionals, and Executives.

[c]Instead of occupational description, subject reported that Principal Adult was "retired", "on relief", or "none".

School Experience and Employment Adjustments

Compared to subjects who had made "poor" adjustments to the world of work, subjects who had made "good" adjustments were very much more apt to have completed more than 9th grade (see Table 104). Very significantly more of the subjects in the "good" categories--"1", "2", and "3"--had completed 10 or more grades than had subjects in the "poor" categories. As might have been expected, the subjects making the poorest adjustment to society (category "5") said that they liked school the least.

Three reasons for leaving school were associated with categories of employment adjustment: (1) very significantly more subjects in category "5" than in category "1" reported that they had been "suspended or expelled"; (2) very significantly more subjects in category "6" than in category "1" reported that they left because they would "rather work than study"; and (3) very significantly more subjects in category "1" than in category "6" reported that they left school because they "got married and had to support my wife." Noticeably[1] more subjects in category "6" than in category "1", also, reported that they had left school because they "needed money for expenses."

Very significantly more subjects in category "6" than in category "1" felt that their reading ability was "worse" than that of the average high school graduate, and noticeably more of the subjects in category "4" than in category "1" reported that their math ability was "worse" than that of the average high school graduate.

[1]A difference is reported as noticeable when it appears to be interesting and falls between a confidence level of .05 and .10.

These results indicated that dropouts in need of employability help tended to have greater educational problems, compounded of lower school achievement and more negative attitudes towards school. Serviceable motivations for productive participation in Manpower Programs for these young men might be achieved through experiences directly related to their preference for work over study and to their desire for money of their own.

TABLE 104

SELECTED SCHOOL EXPERIENCE CHARACTERISTICS
AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Characteristics	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Completed 9th grade or less[a]	42%	32%	18%	58%	52%	58
Like-school rating (mean)[b]	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.0	3.5
Main reasons for leaving school:						
Suspended or expelled	11%	18%	25%	20%	34%	21
Would rather work than study	1%	10%	10%	12%	7%	15
Needed money for expenses	10%	5%	10%	14%	2%	21
Got married and had to support wife	13%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0
Compared to average high school graduate, ability "worse" in:						
Reading	8%	15%	7%	17%	14%	31
Math	26%	25%	20%	41%	36%	35
School helped prepare for job	42%	54%	37%	48%	27%	33

[a]Subjects' reports of school grade completed.

[b]Mean of rating on five-point scale running from "hated it" (1) to "liked it very much" (5).

Characteristics at Time of Interview

Subjects with "good" employment adjustments were older, on the average, than subjects with "poor" adjustments (see Table 105). This characteristic was particularly marked among subjects in adjustment categories "2" and "3".

Compared to subjects who had made "good" adjustment ("1"), subjects who had made "poor" adjustments ("6") were very significantly less apt to be married and living with their wives, were very significantly more apt still to be living in their parental households and to report their parental families as their principal source of support. It was of interest that "good" adjustment was also associated with children when they were living with the subject, while children not living with the subject were about equally as apt to be reported by subjects in all categories of employment adjustment.

Compared to subjects in the highest category ("1"), very significantly more subjects in the lowest category ("6") reported an exclusive dependence on walking as their usual means of getting around the city, and significantly more of the subjects in the lowest category had travelled, at most, 5 miles or less in the month preceding interview.

Subjects in the lowest category of employment adjustment ("6") were noticeably less apt to report that, in considering employment, they had a minimum rate of $2 an hour, or more. It was of interest that this apparently realistic "asking price" was not characteristic of subjects in category "5", three-fifths of whom put their minimum at $2 an hour, or more.

TABLE 105

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Characteristics	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Mean age, 7/1/69 (years)	19.2	20.5	20.3	18.8	19.9	18.9
More than 20 years old	25%	28%	20%	12%	7%	6%
Married, living with wife	28%	20%	16%	10%	0%	2%
Living in parental household	57%	75%	67%	84%	50%	81%
Children:						
Living in subject's household	31%	8%	11%	12%	2%	10%
Living elsewhere	18%	18%	11%	15%	14%	19%
Parental family principal support	3%	13%	41%	45%	25%	52%
Usually walks in getting around	6%	32%	20%	19%	31%	25%
Traveled 5 miles or less last month	23%	23%	33%	26%	33%	40%
Lowest acceptable hourly rate of pay, $2 or more	55%	55%	59%	53%	61%	38%
10-year occupational goal in skilled manual work, or above[a]	79%	82%	88%	84%	83%	82%
Occupational goal related to work in most recent job	29%	36%	29%	16%	16%	11%
Chances of achieving goal rated as "not so good" or "unlikely"	13%	3%	15%	10%	26%	14%
"Nothing holding me back"	63%	54%	61%	41%	38%	45%

[a]See Table 25 for description of occupational categories.

Although approximately the same proportions of subjects in each employment adjustment category had 10-year occupational goals in skilled manual labor or above, noticeably more subjects in the highest category ("1") reported that "nothing (was) holding me back" from the probable achievement of occupational goals. Subjects in category "5" were least likely to give this confident assessment of their prospects, and were most likely to rate their chances of goal achievement as "not so good" or "unlikely." Compared to subjects in the highest category ("1"), noticeably more subjects in the lowest category ("6") had 10-year occupational goals that were unrelated to the kind of work they did in their current or most recent job.

These results indicated that the dropouts most in need of employability help had some latitude in achieving satisfactory adjustments to the world of work in that most were young, unattached, and at least partially supported by their parental families. On the other hand, they tended to be restricted to their home localities and to have had little employment experience that was relevant to their occupational goals.

Manpower Program Information and Employment Adjustment

Almost every subject had heard of the Job Corps, but other Federal Manpower Programs were unknown to a majority of the subjects. Even subjects who "had heard" of the various programs, furthermore, often knew little about the programs, so that the range of information variables was quite limited.

Subjects in the highest category of employment adjustment ("1") were often most similar to subjects in the lowest category of employment adjustment ("6")

with respect to information concerning Manpower Programs (see Table 106). With respect to the In-School NYC, for example, about one-fifth of the subjects in these two categories had heard of the program, six percent in both categories knew where to go if they wanted to apply, and eight percent expressed reasons why a person might not want to use the program.

From one-fourth to one-third of the subjects in the three lowest categories of employment adjustment ("4", "5", and "6") had heard of the Out-of-School NYC--a program that possessed the potential to enhance their employability. One in twenty, or fewer, of these subjects, however, impressed their interviewers as knowing "quite a bit" about the program; and one in 20, or less, knew where to go if they wanted to apply for enrollment in the program. Even though information levels were very low, 11 percent of the subjects in category "4" and 14 percent of the subjects in category "5" gave reasons why a person might not want to use the program.

As noted above, levels of information were highest in connection with the Job Corps; but, at the same time, the proportion of subjects giving reasons for not wanting to be in the Job Corps were higher than comparable percentages for any other program.

Information concerning MDTA programs among subjects in categories "4", "5", and "6" was similar in extent and character to information concerning the Out-of-School NYC. In the poorest adjustment category ("6") three-fourths

of the subjects had never heard of the Out-of-School NYC, and three-fourths had never heard of MDTA. None of the subjects in this category knew where to go if they wanted to apply for either of these programs. Since locating information could easily be developed, the striking absence of location knowledge probably reflected lack of interest in the programs compounded partly of the subjects' perceptions of what they wanted, on the one hand, and what the programs had to offer on the other. Although the percentages involved were very small, responses indicated that adequate knowledge of the programs was generally equalled or exceeded by perceptions of program operations that might make a person <u>not</u> want to use the program.

TABLE 106

FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAM INFORMATION
AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Information	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
In-School NYC						
Had heard of program	22%	17%	18%	21%	13%	18%
Knew where to apply	6%	5%	9%	7%	7%	6%
Knew "quite a bit" about it	10%	13%	16%	9%	5%	4%
Gave reasons for not using it[a]	8%	10%	7%	7%	18%	8%
Out-of-School NYC						
Had heard of program	21%	32%	22%	33%	30%	25%
Knew where to apply	4%	5%	7%	5%	2%	0%
Knew "quite a bit" about it	6%	13%	13%	5%	2%	2%
Gave reasons for not using it[a]	7%	13%	4%	11%	14%	2%
Job Corps						
Had heard of program	99%	95%	93%	100%	100%	96%
Knew where to apply	7%	13%	2%	12%	11%	13%
Knew "quite a bit" about it	25%	40%	36%	35%	43%	27%
Gave reasons for not using it[a]	49%	40%	44%	47%	45%	40%
MDTA						
Had heard of program	21%	53%	44%	35%	34%	25%
Knew where to apply	0%	8%	9%	4%	9%	0%
Knew "quite a bit" about it	3%	18%	13%	4%	5%	10%
Gave reasons for not using it[a]	4%	18%	11%	5%	9%	6%

[a]Reasons specifying drawbacks in program (personnel and operations) only.

Public Employment Agencies and Employment Adjustment

Subjects in the highest category of employment adjustment ("1") reported less ES registration than subjects in any other category except "5" (see Table 107). Subjects in the highest category also reported YOC registration less frequently than subjects in any other category. Although subjects with the best employment adjustments who had registered with the ES or the YOC reported having secured a job through these services about as often as comparable subjects in other categories of adjustment, low registration rates resulted in relatively low placement percentages. Only 10 percent of the subjects in the highest category of employment adjustment had ever gotten a job through the Employment Service, and only 13 percent, through the YOC.

Compared to subjects in the highest category, subjects in the next two highest categories ("2" and "3") reported significantly more registration with public employment agencies, 55 percent of the subjects in "2" having registered with the ES, and 53 percent of the subjects in "3" having registered with the YOC. The proportion of registrants who reported ever having gotten a job through these services also tended to be higher in categories "2" and "3"--particularly the proportions reporting placements through YOC. Categories "2" and "3" thus tended to show more utilization of the ES and the YOC than did category "1".

Subjects in categories of poor adjustment ("4", "5", and "6") exhibited varying utilization of the ES and YOC. With respect to the ES, subjects in "4" and "6" were closest to subjects in the "good" category "2". Subjects in the

"poor" category "5", however, reported the least utilization of the ES--only 25 percent had ever registered with the ES, and only 2 percent had ever gotten a job through the ES. With respect to the YOC, though, subjects in category "5" were about as apt to have registered as subjects in all other categories except "3"; and subjects in "5" and "6" were less apt to ever have gotten a job through YOC than subjects in categories "2", "3", or "4".

Very few subjects reported ES or YOC employment services other than job referral, and the incidence of reports of such services (referrals to training programs, and counsel) tended to be confined to subjects in the higher categories of employment adjustment. None of the subjects in category "5", for example, reported such services from either the ES or the YOC; and only 2 percent of the subjects in categories "4" and "6" reported such services from the ES, while none reported such services from the YOC.

TABLE 107

UTILIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTER, AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Utilization	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Employment Service						
Heard of ES	86%	93%	91%	88%	82%	85%
Registered with ES	27	55	33	47	25	46
Job through ES	10	20	9	25	2	13
Referrals to training programs, counsel	4%	10%	9%	2%	0%	2%
Youth Opportunity Center						
Heard of YOC	76%	80%	90%	80%	70%	63%
Registered with YOC	30	40	53	45	36	35
Job through YOC	13	30	27	27	14	19
Referrals to training programs, counsel	6%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%

Subjects in category "5" reported, on the average, 2.7 ways in which they usually looked for jobs--considerably more than the average in other categories of employment adjustment (see Table 108). Taking into consideration the total number of responses in the various adjustment categories, the principal differences between subjects in these groups involved the weight given to two ways of looking for jobs: asking friends, and using the Employment Service.

Compared to subjects in category "1", subjects in categories "3" and "4" were significantly less apt to report that they usually asked their friends when

they were job-hunting. Subjects in category "1", on the other hand, less frequently reported the Employment Service than did subjects in other categories. The differences in this respect were large enough to be significant in comparisons with categories "2", "3", and "4".

Study results indicated no consistent relationship between the utilization of public employment services and employment adjustment. Although subjects in adjustment categories "2" and "3" reported considerable utilization of these services, so, also, did subjects with poorer employment adjustments; and subjects with the best employment adjustments ("1") reported comparatively less utilization of public employment services. These results suggest that subjects with poor adjustments to the world of work are, perhaps, more in need of employability enhancement than placement assistance; and that the latter will continue to be ineffective until the subject has become qualified to hold jobs that are satisfactory to him. If so, the very slight extent of referrals to training programs reported by subjects in categories "4", "5", and "6" indicated a serious malfunction in the employment opportunity system. At the same time, the fact that about two-fifths of the subjects in categories "4" and "6" mentioned the Employment Service as a job-finding resource indicated that these subjects might be reached through the Service.

TABLE 108

USUAL WAYS OF LOOKING FOR JOBS
AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Ways of Looking	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Asked friends	56%	45%	29%	40%	61%	50%
Asked family, relatives, family friends	25	18	22	27	40	38
Checked local newspaper ads	49	50	47	52	45	38
Private employment agencies	15	5	2	8	14	10
Public Employment Services	24	53	40	43	33	40
Applied in person where firms said to be hiring	28	23	27	27	29	19
Applied in person to firms to find out whether hiring	36	28	29	30	40	33
Applied to companies outside of city	3	0	2	3	4	2
TOTAL[a]	235%	220%	198%	230%	270%	230%

[a]More than one way could be reported.

Attitudes and Employment Adjustment

Compared to "most young men who are your friends", 18 percent of the subjects in category "4" and 31 percent of the subjects in category "5" felt that they were getting along "not so well" or "much worse" (see Table 109). Only 6 percent of the subjects in the lowest employment adjustment category ("6"), however, responded in this way--results that suggested that most of their friends may have been in the same boat. Two indicators of the characteristics of peer groups--extent of full-time employment, and dropout grade level--showed no significant differences between adjustment groupings with the exception of the extent of full-time employment of friends reported by subjects in category "1". More than three-fifths of the subjects in category "1" reported that "all" or "most" or their friends had full-time employment--more than comparable proportions in any other adjustment category, and significantly more than in categories "3", "5", and "6". In general, then, compared to subjects in category "1", "friends" could be expected to be a less-valuable job-hunting resource for subjects in the other adjustment categories. It was of interest that subjects in category "3" may have recognized this by placing relatively less weight on this source of job information.

The extent of poor peer-self assessments in category "5" was probably largely due to jailing--the principal characteristic of this category. The extent of poor assessments in category "4" cannot readily be interpreted. It was of interest, however, that relatively more of the peers of this category had full-time employment and had gone beyond 10th grade than was the case in the other poor adjustment categories.

TABLE 109

SUBJECTS' COMPARISONS OF SELF WITH REPORTS
OF "MOST YOUNG MEN WHO ARE YOUR FRIENDS"
AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Comaprisons and Reports	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Subject is getting along "not as well" or "much worse" than friends	3%	2%	8%	18%	31%	6%
"All" or "most" of friends have full-time jobs	63%	50%	41%	46%	38%	39%
"Most" friends dropped out of school before completing 10th grade	25%	30%	24%	21%	34%	31%

Subjects in the various categories of employment adjustment differed considerably in their reports of family attitudes and practices (see Table 110), with the extremes of hi-lo comparisons usually associated with good-poor adjustments. Very significantly more of the subjects (20 percent) in category "6" than in category "1" (5 percent) reported that their families had expected "too much" of them; and very significantly more of the subjects (21 percent) in category "5" than in category "1" (5 percent) reported that their families had "seldom" or "never" paid attention to their wishes in family decisions that concerned them. Significantly more of the subjects (80 percent) in category "3" than in

category "6" (60 percent) reported that their families had been "very interested" in their activities; and very significantly more of the subjects in category "3" (77 percent) than in category "4" (42 percent) reported that their families had been "always" or "usually" fair with them. One hi-lo difference occurred between the two lowest categories: 15 percent of the subjects in category "5", and none of the subjects in category "6" reported that their families had been "too easy" with them. One other difference, noticeable at the .10 level of confidence, has been reported in Table 110--13 percent of the subjects in categories "4" and "5", as compared with only 2 percent of the subjects in category "3", reported that their families "didn't care" when they dropped out of school.

TABLE 110

SUBJECTS' REPORTS OF FAMILY ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES UP TO TIME OF DROPOUT, AND CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Attitudes and Practices	1 N=72	2 N=40	3 N=45	4 N=60	5 N=44	6 N=48
Family expected "too much"	5%	7%	4%	5%	11%	20%
Family "usually" or "always" fair in dealings with subject	66%	65%	77%	42%	52%	58%
Family was "too easy" with subject	5%	5%	4%	11%	15%	0%
Family was "very interested" in subject's activities	62%	62%	80%	66%	63%	60%
Family "seldom" or "never" paid attention to subject's wishes in de isions concerning him	5%	14%	8%	8%	21%	16%
Family "didn't care" whether subject dropped out of school	6%	7%	2%	13%	13%	8%

Mean degrees of agreement with various statements of attitude, like the qualitative distributions of attitudes reported in Table 110, often showed a general consistency with good-poor adjustments to the world of work. Comparisons based on combined extreme categories ("1" and "2" compared with "5" and "6") indicated significant attitudinal differences associated with adjustments to the world of work (see Table 111). Compared to subjects who had made good adjustments, subjects who had made poor adjustments agreed more, on the average, with the statements that "Most work is dull and boring" and "Your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time." Subjects with poor adjustments agreed less, on the average, with the statements "Your chances of having a happy home life are good," "So far in your life you feel that you have been very lucky," and "You have a lot of confidence in yourself."

Ten attitude questions were included in the interview schedule, and in each case the subject making a better adjustment to work gave, on the average, a more "sociolized" response than did the poorly adjusted group. For five of the ten questions the differences were significant at the .05 level of confidence or greater. For two other questions, the confidence level was between .05 and .10. These findings support previous research that Optimism, Self Confidence, and Unsociolozed Attitudes are related to work adjustment.[1]

[1]See The Social Research Group of The George Washington University (Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator) "A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs--The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes" (1969).

TABLE 111

SIGNIFICANT ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COMBINED CATEGORIES[a] OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Attitude Statement[b]	Adjustment		CONFIDENCE[c] LEVEL
	Good N=112	Poor N=92	
It is better to live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself	2.47	2.24	NS
Most work is dull and boring	2.71	2.39	.05
You feel that your chances of having a happy home life in the future are good	1.58	1.95	.01
You feel that so far in your life you have been very lucky	1.85	2.24	.01
When people "bug" you, they should be told off even if it means trouble	2.70	2.50	NS
You would say that you have a lot of confidence in yourself	1.29	1.50	.05
Most of your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time	3.12	2.82	.05
Most people cannot be trusted	2.39	2.17	NS
If you try hard enough, you have a chance of succeeding in whatever you want to do	1.27	1.42	.10
You feel that you are as capable and as smart as most other people	1.61	1.80	.10

[a]"Good" is made up of employment adjustment categories "1" and "2", and "Poor" is made up of categories "5" and "6".

[b]Mean degree of agreement based on a five-point scale running from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5).

[c]Two-tailed tests of significance. "NS" indicates that, in the judgment of the author, differences are "not significant" and should be attributed to chance.

Summary

On the basis of their activities since leaving school, interviewed subjects were sorted into six ranked categories of employment adjustment. About half had achieved "good" adjustments, and about half, "poor." Subjects with "good" adjustments might, nevertheless, benefit from employability help; but their needs for such help were far less urgent than those of subjects with "poor" adjustments who, more than two years after leaving school, were still not making it in the world of work.

The characteristics of subjects in the "poor" adjustment categories indicated that their employability needs were not only more but different. Subjects in the two poorest adjustment categories, for example, differed significantly in their optimism, self-ccnfidence, perception of preparational deficiencies, and attitudes towards schooling. The productive participation of such subjects in Manpower Programs thus implied a need for differential strategies of involvement. This and other issues will be discussed in the next chapter on Improving the Reach of the Manpower Programs.

VIII

Improving the Reach of Federal Manpower Programs

The foregoing chapters have reported study results describing the characteristics of Negro male dropouts in Baltimore and St. Louis, including those characteristics that indicated needs for employability help and those characteristics that indicated barriers to participation in Federal Manpower Programs that might provide such help. This chapter reviews these results in the light of their implications for possible improvements in program operations.

Extent of Need

Various indicators of employability needs showed extensive need for employability assistance two and one-half years on the average after study subjects had dropped out of school. At the time of interview, when the average age was 20.3 years, 27 percent of the subjects in the civilian labor force were unemployed and looking for work. This statistic, however, does not reflect the full extent of the need since a large proportion of the subjects were outside the labor market. Considering only interviewed subjects and eliminating subjects who were in school, training programs, or military service, we found that 45 percent reported current activities that indicated adjustment problems (employed part-time, unemployed and either seeking or not seeking work, jailed), while 55 percent reported full-time employment. Even the subjects reporting full-time employment could not be considered fully adjusted to the world of work. About 12 percent of these subjects were earning $1.60 per hour or less; 27 percent had been in their current jobs 10 weeks or less; and 71 percent had occupational goals unrelated to their current jobs. About one-fourth of these subjects rated their chances of achieving their occupational goals as "not so good" or "unlikely," while only about one-third thought that they had a "very good" chance of achieving their goals.

In summary, at an average age of a little more than 20 years, a large proportion of the sample of Negro male school dropouts was having difficulty adjusting to the world of work. Depending upon the adjustment criterion used, the extent of occupational maladjustment ranged from 29 to 84 percent (see Table 112). The unemployed subjects were in the most urgent need of employability help. At the same time, many of the subjects with full-time employment might profit from opportunities to upgrade vocational skills, including the behavioral skills involved in finding and keeping jobs since only 29 percent of them were in jobs related to their 10-year occupational goals.

TABLE 112

PROPORTION OF INTERVIEWED SAMPLE MAKING A POOR OCCUPATIONAL ADJUSTMENT USING VARIOUS ADJUSTMENT CRITERIA

Category	Baltimore and St. Louis
	Percent
Unemployed labor force participants	29%
Not employed full-time[a]	47
Not employed full-time or not in a job relevant to 10-year goal[a]	84

[a]Subjects in school, training, or military service were excluded.

Eligibility for Federal Manpower Programs

Manpower programs, such as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, require that the participants qualify under poverty guidelines. The

evidence from this research indicates that a large proportion of Negro male school dropouts in St. Louis and Baltimore qualified under these criteria. Family background data showed that 79 percent of the principal adults in the families of study subjects had not completed high school; that 88 percent were either blue collar workers or without occupational status; and that the median family income in the year preceding dropout was $4,090, with an average family size of 6.6 persons. One-fifth of the study subjects were from families that had received welfare assistance "all" or "most" of the time while they were growing up; and 30 percent were in "mother only" families at the time of dropout. Compared to the family backgrounds of Out-of-School NYC enrollees,[1] these data indicated that poverty was almost as prevalent among the Negro male dropout subjects as it was among young people who had qualified for NYC enrollment. Comparison of subjects in the present study who had never enrolled in Manpower Programs with subjects who had ever enrolled also indicated little difference in this respect.[2]

[1]See Social Research Group of The George Washington University (Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator), "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Four Urban Out-of-School NYC Programs, Phase II." In a composite study group of 388 enrollees in Cincinnati, Durham, East St. Louis, and St. Louis, 24 percent reported welfare assistance "all" or "most" of the time, 29 percent were in "mother only" families, and 95 percent were in families with blue collar breadwinners or in families in which the principal adult had no occupational status (pp. 10, 19, and 21, respectively).

[2]See above study, p. 37. Twenty percent of those who have never enrolled and 16 percent of those who have ever enrolled, reported annual family incomes in the year before dropout of $6,000 or more.

As barriers to participation in Manpower Programs, poverty enrollment criteria would thus appear to exclude only a small proportion of the sample. While most study subjects were poor enough to have qualified for enrollment in programs with poverty selection criteria, it should be noted that employability needs did not seem to be closely related to economic status. Thus, subjects who did not meet the poverty standards appeared to have as great a need for enhanced employability as those who did.

Reach of Manpower Programs

Unawareness of the NYC and of MDTA training programs could sufficiently account for the lion's share of nonparticipation in these programs by subjects with salient employability needs. Three-fourths of the subjects in the poorest adjustment category and two-thirds of the subjects in the next two poorest categories, had never heard of these Manpower Programs. Less than one in twenty of the subjects in these "poor" adjustment categories impressed their interviewers as knowing "quite a bit" about the NYC, and less than one in ten, as knowing "quite a bit" about MDTA. At least 90 percent of these subjects thus lacked the information that might enable them to participate in these programs.

The Job Corps was much better known than either the NYC or MDTA programs--almost every subject had heard of it, and about one-third of them knew "quite a bit" about the program. More than two-fifths of the subjects, however, specified program drawbacks in the reasons they gave why a person might not want to be in the Job Corps. With the Job Corps, therefore, the character of information and--to the extent that this information was accurate, the character of the program--seemed to be barriers to participation.

Being away from home was given as a reason for <u>not</u> wanting to be in the Job Corps almost twice as often as it was given as a reason for wanting to be in the Corps. The net effect of this program feature thus may have been a restriction of the program's reach. The major implications for program operations of such offset impressions of program features, however, would seem to involve the recognition not only of differential employability needs but also of differential characteristics that importantly modify reactions to the program.

While the impressions of the various programs indicated that some misinformation was present, the idea of these programs as training opportunities came through quite clearly in the positive impressions. In the negative impressions, on the other hand, the vocational experiences of these training programs often seemed to have been considered as a job. These results could be interpreted as implying a need to fortify the training images of programs or as implying a need to associate the programs more closely with desirable jobs.

The extensive employability needs, summarized in an earlier section, reflected for the most part the adjustments of dropout youths who had never enrolled in the out-of-school Manpower Programs. The original design of the study called for the exclusion of youths with Manpower Program experience, but practical difficulties resulted in the inclusion of some young men who had enrolled in these programs. The employability needs of these young men--about 16 percent of all interviewed subjects--were substantially similar to those of subjects who had never enrolled in Manpower Programs. Although these results should not be considered as indications of the effectiveness of these programs, they were of

interest as indications that enrollment is only the beginning of effective reach.

In addition to the finding that about the same proportions of "ever enrolled" and "never enrolled" subjects were in poor adjustment categories, it was of interest that 62 percent of the subjects who had ever enrolled in the Job Corps reported that the training and experience they got through the Job Corps had not helped them get a job. The slight reflections of Manpower Program experience in the study showed short and single enrollments. These results, together with study results indicating the extent of need, tend to support findings from earlier research that effective employability help may require multiple enrollments.[1] The characteristics of persons with employability needs, discussed in the next section, should be taken into account not only in the determination of employability objectives but in the design of program strategies to achieve these objectives.

The Nature of Need

The extent of need for employability assistance has been well documented in a previous section. The nature of this need will now be explored through a series of propositions.

[1]See, for example, Social Research Group of The George Washington University (Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator), "A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs: Implications for Program Operations and Research," (1969), pp.32-34.

The Need for Employability Assistance is not Restricted to Unemployed Youths Looking for Work.

While, for some purposes, it is desirable to restrict the idea of unemployment to those persons who are not working but looking for work, for other purposes it is useful to consider a wider range of unemployed activities. The employability needs of dropout youths, for example, are only partially reflected in the activities that conventionally comprise the labor force. Youths who are outside the civilian labor force--youths not working nor looking for work, in jail, in schools or training programs, or in military service--have more or less urgent employability needs that may bring them within the purview of Manpower programs. In particular, youths who are not doing anything--not working, not looking for work, not in school or training, and not in service--would seem to be in need of help that would get them into the mainstream of productive activity. An early study[1] of the employment of high school graduates and dropouts drew attention to the fairly large percentage of youths--particularly dropout youths--who were not working and not looking for work. In the present study, five percent of the interviewed subjects were in this activity category. These subjects have been considered to have employability needs as urgent--though not necessarily of the same kind--as subjects who were unemployed and looking for work.

[1]Jacob Schiffman, "Employment of High School Graduates and Dropouts in 1961," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 85, No. 5 (May, 1962), pp. 502-509. Schiffman found that 8.8 percent of the 1959 dropouts were not in the labor force or in school in October, 1961, and somewhat higher percentages of '60 and '61 dropouts were in this classification.

Unemployment did not Result Primarily from Lack of Job Opportunities.

Unemployment, a primary indicator of need for enhanced employability, was apparently the result of poor employment adjustments rather than of the lack of job opportunities. Subjects in the study on the average had held almost three jobs since dropping out of school, and twelve percent of the subjects had held six jobs or more. Lack of jobs, therefore, did not seem to be a major problem for these young men. While 11 percent of the subjects reported no jobs since dropping out, their non-employment was associated primarily with activities outside the civilian labor force. Only four subjects had been unsuccessfully looking for work throughout the period, and all of these impressed their interviewers as being mentally retarded. In view of the circumstances associated with joblessness, as well as the number of jobs reported, it thus can be concluded that in Baltimore and St. Louis during the period covered by the study, the subjects in the study were able to find jobs.

On the average, it was estimated that subjects were unemployed and looking for work about 1.6 months per job. This estimate was based on the estimated time in this activity between dropout and the date of interview, and the average number of jobs reported for this period.

Job Turnover Resulted Primarily from Non-Economic Causes.

Two primary economic causes of job turnover are unacceptably low wages and elimination of jobs by the employer for economic reasons. Neither of these factors appeared to be an important cause of job turnover in the present study.

Comparisons of highest hourly rates of pay in the current or most recent job and minimum acceptable hourly rates of pay indicated that subjects were able to find jobs that met their standards of pay (see Table 113). In each adjustment category, the average hourly rate of pay actually earned by the subjects exceeded the average minimum acceptable hourly rate. It thus can be concluded that the employment problems of study subjects were not reflective primarily of job scarcity or of what available jobs paid.

TABLE 113

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE PAY ON MOST RECENT JOB WITH AVERAGE LOWEST ACCEPTABLE PAY BY RANKED ADJUSTMENT CATEGORIES

Ranked Categories	Pay Most Recent Job N=247	Lowest Acceptable Pay N=302
Category 1[a]	$2.34	$2.10
2	$2.32	$2.14
3	$2.14	$2.07
4	$2.15	$2.00
5	$2.13	$2.05
6	$2.09	$1.87
Total Group	$2.19	$2.04

[a]See pp. 146-147 for definitions of categories.

About half of the study subjects who no longer had their most recent job reported that they had quit because of dissatisfaction with the job or for personal reasons, and 13 percent reported that they had been fired. While 18 percent of these subjects reported that the job had ended, most of the job losses reflected maladjustments to the job rather than impermanent employment as such. The major cause of job turnover thus seemed to lie in lack of fit--either the subject did not fit the job, or vice versa.

There was a Wide Discrepancy Between Occupational Goals and Current Job.

Another aspect of occupational maladjustment was suggested by discrepancies between subjects' occupational experience and goals (see Table 114). Almost 40 percent of the subjects wanted to be in high-level jobs--in executive or managerial positions, in business for themselves, or in professional work--in 10 years; but none of them reported any experience in these fields and most were far down the occupational ladder from these goals. Part of the apparent discrepancy between goals and experience might reflect the immaturity and inexperience of many of the subjects and this might have been recognized by the 27 percent who reported that their chances of achievement were "not so good" or "unlikely." While these data are not inconsistent with motivations to achieve occupational improvement, they also suggest a large amount of frustration with occupational experience.

TABLE 114

COMPARISON OF 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB

Occupational Category	Most Recent Job	10-Year Goal
	Percent	Percent
Entrepreneur, Professional, and Semi-Professional	--	33%
Executive, Managers and Supervisors	--	6
Clerical and Sales	10	12
Sub-Professional and Technicians	4	2
Crafts, Trades	12	30
Machine Operators	10	5
Factory Work and Semi-Skilled	17	3
Food Preparation and Service	9	1
Other and Unskilled	39	2
Unspecified	--	6
Total	101%	100%

Need did not Decrease with Age in the Age Ranges Included in this Study.

It is generally accepted that the incidence of unemployment, and the corresponding employability needs for vocational skills and placement help, tend to decrease with age. One recent study has suggested that the age of 20 may be critical, with high youth unemployment rates occurring in the teenage years and

unemployment approaching national averages after the age of 20.[1] While the present study was not designed to investigate unemployment trends related to age, study results throw some light on this subject.

The activities of interviewed subjects at three points in time--approximately 12 months, 24 months, and 33 months after leaving school--showed no decrease in the proportions of unemployment. At the final point in time, the time of interview, subjects averaged slightly more than 20 years of age. These results, therefore, did not indicate reductions in unemployment associated with age through an average age of 20.

Comparisons between subjects born in 1948 or before (and therefore at least 20.5 years old at time of interview) and younger subjects, showed that the older subjects reported significantly more full-time employment as of 1/1/68, as well as significantly more employment as of the date of interview (see Table 115). While the over-20 subjects thus were more likely than the under-20 to be employed at the time of interview, the older subjects were also more likely to have been employed shortly after having left school when they were 18 years old, or younger. The better employment adjustments of the older subjects thus would be more adequately explained by the assumption that factors influencing age of school dropout also influences employability.

[1]See Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, Career Thresholds, Vol. 1, (Manpower Research Monograph No. 16), p. 74.

The study results reviewed above did not provide adequate tests of the idea that the incidence of unemployment is sharply reduced after the age of 20. At the same time, they did not support expectations based on this idea. On the contrary, study results indicated that employability needs were persistent and were not markedly reduced by the passage of time reflected in the study. In a previous study, some reduction in unemployment rate was found between the ages of 21 and 22.5, but the rate at age 22.5 for school dropouts meeting poverty guide lines was even higher than what has been reported in this study.[1]

TABLE 115

COMPARISON OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF 1/1/68 AND DATE OF INTERVIEW BY DATE OF BIRTH, ALL INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS NOT IN SCHOOL, TRAINING PROGRAMS, OR MILITARY SERVICE

Full-time Employment	As of 1/1/68 Year of Birth		As of date of Interview Year of Birth	
	1948 or earlier N=37	1949 or later N=205	1948 or earlier N=47	1949 or later N=242
Employed full-time	73%	54%	81%	49%
Not employed full-time	27%	46%	19%	51%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

[1]See Social Research Group of The George Washington University (Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator), "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Four Urban Out-of-School Programs Phase II (1969), p. 30.

Lack of Education or Training Reported as Principal Barrier to Occupational Goal Achievement.

When asked, "What might hold you back from achieving your occupational goal?" approximately one-half of the subjects said that nothing was holding them back. This response might indicate either low occupational goals, the absence of career planning, or an unwillingness to discuss the question candidly with the interviewer. Among those who did report a deterrent however, about 76 percent said that lack of education or training was holding them back and only two percent reported that discrimination was a factor. The significance of these results was difficult to interpret. The unwillingness of the respondents to assign to society the responsibility for their limited occupational prospects is contrary to what is generally expected. It would be interesting to explore this issue further to determine whether this was a true reflection of their feelings or whether it was a "socially approved" response given to the interviewers.

Program Implications

Study results suggested that the employability assistance needed by Negro male school dropouts in the center cities of large metropolitan areas were general, not limited to those qualifying under the poverty guide lines, and continued past the age of 20.

The first priority of Manpower Programs, to make the target populations aware of what is available was, met by the Job Corps but not by the Out-of-School NYC or MDTA programs. The apparent success of the widespread use of media

announcements by the Job Corps suggests that this means of reaching youth in need of the services of Manpower Programs might increase the awareness of other programs. Improvement in counseling by schools, State Employment Services, and Youth Opportunity Centers also is needed if this client population is to be reached. The usual channels of information--friends and family--clearly cannot be relied on to produce awareness of Manpower Programs.

Advertisements and other means of disseminating information concerning Manpower Programs, however, are only the first steps in achieving effective employability assistance. The services provided by the programs must be relevant to the needs of these youth. Such needs are varied, hard to identify, and hard to meet, but they must be recognized if program operations are to be effective.

Employability help involves, on the one hand, consideration of the perceptions of youths with employability problems; and, on the other hand, the effective remediation of employability handicaps. The fact that most of the data produced by this study involved the perceptions of dropout youths must be taken into account, but programs must deliver in terms of basic employability enhancement. The motivation for instant employability must, somehow, be stretched and buttressed to power the acquisition of skills essential to productive participation in the world of work. Expansion of job opportunities or the development of specific job skills do not appear to be enough. The job should appear to the youth to offer a career opportunity and at the same time the youth must develop skills directly focussed on job objectives as well as other skills such as

management of self that make it possible for an individual to function effectively in his job.[1]

Fine has suggested that human performance is a complex of three sequential skills: Adaptability, Functional, and Specific Content skills. Adaptability skills appear to be a precondition of acquiring Functional skills and both Adaptability and Functional skills appear to be a precondition for acquiring Specific Content skills. These skills are defined as follows:

Adaptive skills refer to those competencies that enable an individual to accept and adjust to the physical, interpersonal, and organizational arrangements and conditions in which a job exists. Included are punctuality, grooming, acceptance of supervision, care of property, getting along with others, and impulse control. These skills are normally acquired in the early developmental years, primarily in the family situation and among one's peers, and reinforced in the school situation.

Functional skills refer to those competencies that enable individuals to relate to Things, Data, and People in some combination according to their personal preferences and to some degree of complexity appropriate to their abilities. They include skills like tending or operating machines; comparing, compiling, or analyzing data; and exchanging information, consulting and supervising

[1]The discussion here borrows very heavily on Sidney A. Fine, "Nature of Skill: Implications for Education and Training." Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, 1967.

people. These skills are normally acquired in educational, training, and avocational pursuits and reinforced in specific job situations.

Specific Content skills refer to those competencies that enable an individual to perform a specific job according to the specifications of an employer and according to the standards required to satisfy the market. These skills are normally acquired either in an advanced technical training school or institute, extensive on-the-job experience, or on a specific job. They are as numerous as specific products, services, and employers who establish the standards and conditions under which those products and services are produced.

The concentration in classroom training programs has been on Functional skills; and in on-the-job training programs, on Specific Content skills, ignoring for the most part Adaptive skills. Numerous government training programs designed to train the disadvantaged somehow have not achieved their objectives of on-the-job success for the trainees, although the trainees appeared to acquire Functional skills during their training. What probably happened was that they lacked "management of self" skills which continuously blocked their acquisition of on-the-job skills that would enable them to use their functional potential to the best advantage. The problems that have developed have to do with the worker's punctuality, regularity of attendance, dealing with authority, and interpersonal situations, even when the trainees were able to perform the tasks under the relatively idealized circumstances of the training situation.

Perhaps the primary problem in training the disadvantaged youth effectively is teaching them Adaptive skills appropriate to productive work in our economy after they have reached the age of 16 or more. A particularly difficult aspect of this problem is that people who have grown up in disadvantaged, racist, or ghetto environments have frequently developed Adaptive skills which may be suitable in the ghetto environment (for example, keeping continually on the move), but which are essentially nonadaptive in normal work situations. These are hard to change because they become embedded in the life style of the individual.

The development of Adaptive skills in out-of-school youth can probably be achieved better on the job than through a classroom approach and it is likely to be a slow, difficult process in which the youth needs to learn from his mistakes and to be rewarded for his successes. Training and employment opportunities need to be kept available, but it should be recognized that the youth may not be able to take advantage of these opportunities at any particular time, but may need to make some mistakes before he is motivated to apply himself. Training opportunities of the type provided by MDTA programs are useful, but can, by themselves, solve the problems of only a small proportion of the youth. Programs like JOBS and PSC which follow the policy of "hire first, train later" can be useful strategies for youth with Adaptive skills above some minimal level, but cannot be expected to meet the needs of youth with Adaptive skills falling below that level. The Job Corps can be expected to help certain types of the youth

outside the community and the NYC can help other types of youth inside the community to improve their Adaptive skills, but then further assistance at the Functional skill levels can perhaps be provided by MDTA, JOBS, and PSC programs.

The important point is that the process of enhancing the employability of these youth can be expected to be slow and complex. Contact with such a youth should be established at the time he drops out of school, or, if possible, at an earlier time when it becomes clear that he is a potential dropout. The training and employment opportunities available should be made known to him at that time and he should be counseled in the development of career plans. Then contact should be maintained with him until he achieves satisfactory employment. Failure in one program should not exclude him from another. Opportunities should be kept open to him, he should be made aware of these opportunities and encouraged to use them.

Seriously disadvantaged youth often need a number of chances--if a single opportunity were enough, most of them could succeed without special assistance. Our earlier studies also have suggested that the best results are achieved when reasonable standards are maintained and that excessive leniency or excessive strictness tends to reduce the value of training or work experience. Manpower Programs should help the youth test reality and temporarily terminate him when he fails to meet reasonable performance standards. He should, however, be encouraged to return when he makes a decision to meet the standards of the program. Such an approach over a period of time can help him develop his Adaptive

skills.

While the development of Adaptive and Functional skills appears to be a crucial element in an effective manpower program, the nature of the job opportunity structure cannot be ignored. It is clear from our study that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of available jobs. Efforts to expand the range of jobs, which can be realistically considered by Negro male school dropouts, can be expected to pay big dividends, as can programs for upgrading the skills of the already employed and the elimination of dead-end jobs through redesigning of jobs.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A STUDY OF PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL WORK-TRAINING PROGRAMS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University SRG/40

I.D. # 4 0 ___ ___ ___ ___

I'm an interviewer for The George Washington University in Washington, D.C. We are doing a study in several cities of young men and their employment problems. For this study, we have been interviewing many men with a lot of different kinds of experience. We hope you will help us by telling us what you think. Our conversation will be kept confidential, of course.

(TIME INTERVIEW BEGAN ____:____ a.m.

____:____ p.m.)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

1-6 Before we begin, would you tell me . . .

7,8- 1. Where were you born? _____ (city) _____ (state)

9,10- 2. When were you born? ____/____/____/ mo da yr

11- 3. How many years have you lived in this city? _____

12,13- 4. (IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR) How many months? _____

14,15- 5. In how many different houses, apartments or rooming houses in this city have you lived? _____ (number)

16- 6. Now let's talk a little about your school experience. Thinking back to September, 1966 . . . After September, 1966, did you ever quit school before graduating from high school? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

17,18- 7. What date did you leave school? ____/____/ mo yr

19-

20,21- 8. What was the last grade you had completed when you left school? _____ (grade)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

9. (HAND CARD 1)
People have different reasons for leaving school. Please look at this list and tell me if any of these were your reasons for leaving school. (READ CONTENTS OF CARD ALOUD. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE FOR ALL REASONS.)

22A- A. Some subjects were too difficult

23B- B. Wasn't learning anything in school

24C- C. Didn't get along well with teachers

25D- D. Didn't get along well with other students

26E- E. Was suspended or expelled

27F- F. Parents wanted me to leave; had to help out my family

28G- G. Would rather work than study

29H- H. Lost interest in school

30I- I. Graduated

31J- J. Wanted to enlist in the military service

32K- K. Got married and had to support my wife

33L- L. Didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses

34M- M. Other reasons (WHAT?) _____

_____

35,36- 10. What was the main reason, of all those you have mentioned, why you left school? (UNDERLINE ONE MAIN REASON)

(RETRIEVE CARD 1)

37- 11. If you were asked to rate how much you liked school, using the numbers 1 to 5, and choosing 5 meant you liked it very much and choosing 1 meant you hated it, which number from 1 to 5 would you choose to show how you felt about school in general? (CIRCLE)

Hated it				Liked it very much
1	2	3	4	5

38,39- 12. Why do you say that? (PROBE: Anything else?) _____

_____

_____

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

40- 13. When you left school, did you feel that what you learned there had helped prepare you for a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 15)

41,42- 14. What, specifically, did you learn that helped prepare you for a job?

_____

_____

43- 15. Would you say that you can read better, worse, or about the same as the average high school graduate? (CIRCLE)

1 Better than average
2 Worse than average
3 The same as average

44- 16. Would you say that you can do math better, worse, or about the same as the average high school graduate? (CIRCLE)

1 Better than average
2 Worse than average
3 The same as average

45- 17. Did you return to regular full-time school after the time you left school? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 21)

18. What was the total number of hours of class time? (PROBE FOR EXACT INFORMATION BASED ON NUMBER OF HOURS PER DAY, NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK, AND NUMBER OF WEEKS.)

_____ X _____ X _____ = _____
(Hrs. per day) (Days per week) (No. of weeks) (Total Hours)

46,47- 19. What were the dates? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

48,49- 20. What was the highest grade you completed after returning? _____
(grade)

50- 21. Did you ever try to finish school in special classes or schools, like adult education or night school?

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 23)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

22. How far did you get? Did you earn any specific credits, finish any grades or pass the General Educational Development (GED) test? (CIRCLE LETTER/S)

51,52A- A. Credits earned _____ (number)

53B- B. Additional grades finished _____ (grades)

54C- C. Passed the GED test

55D- D. Any other progess (SPECIFY) _____

56E- E. No progress

57- 23. While you were not attending school full-time, did you take any vocational or training courses like welding or machine shop, or did you go to business or trade school? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 29)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

58- 24. What vocational or training courses have you had? (LIST)

_____

_____

_____

(FOR EACH ONE OF TOTAL NUMBER OF COURSES, FILL IN THE INFORMATION FOR THE FOUR QUESTIONS BELOW. IF MORE THAN FOUR COURSES WERE TAKEN, USE THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE.)

		Course A	Course B	Course C	Course D
59- 60- 61- 62-	25. What kind of work were you being trained for?				
	25a. Where did you go for the training?				
63,64- 65,66- 67,68- 69,70-	26. What were the dates?	___/___/ mo yr TO ___/___/ mo yr	___/___/ mo yr TO ___/___/ mo yr	___/___/ mo yr TO ___/___/ mo yr	___/___/ mo yr TO ___/___/ mo yr
71-	27. Did you complete the training? (CIRCLE)	1 Yes	1 Yes	1 Yes	1 Yes
72-		2 No	2 No	2 No	2 No
73-	28. Did you get any kind of certificate or license to show that you are qualified	1 Yes	1 Yes	1 Yes	1 Yes
74-	to do that kind of work? (CIRCLE	2 No	2 No	2 No	2 No

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

75- 29. Now let's go back to the time when you were growing up . . . During most of the time before you left school, did you live with <u>both</u> your father and mother? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO") Please tell me with whom you did live

_____

76- 30. What kind of work was (FATHER OR PERSON NAMED) doing most of that time?

(DESCRIBE) _____

DECK 2

1-6-

7- 31. Was (FATHER OR PERSON NAMED) working at the time you left school? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

8,9- 32. What was the highest grade of schooling that (FATHER OR PERSON NAMED) completed?

_____
(grade)

10- 33. (HAND CARD 2) Now we would like to know about your family's income for the last year before you left school. Would you please look at this card and tell me which number comes closest to describing the <u>total</u> family income at that time? (CIRCLE)

1 Below $1000
2 From $1000 to $2000
3 From $2000 to $3000
4 From $3000 to $4000
5 From $4000 to $5000
6 From $5000 to $6000
7 From $6000 to $7000
8 From $7000 to $8000
9 Above $8000

(RETRIEVE CARD 2)

11,12- 34. At the time before you left school, how many people, counting both children and adults, were living in your household?

_____
(number)

13- 35. How many of these were working and helping out with family expenses?

_____
(number)

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

14- 36. Up to the time you left school, did your family ever receive welfare payments, not counting Social Security or unemployment or strike benefits? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
5 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 38)

15- 37. About how much of the time did they receive welfare--all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or only once or twice? (CIRCLE)

1 All of the time
2 Most of the time
3 Some of the time
4 Only once or twice

16- 38. Are you married now or were you ever married? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 41)

39. Are you living with your wife now or are you separated, divorced or widowed? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

1 Married, living with wife
2 Separated
3 Divorced
4 Widowed

17,18- 40. On what date were you married? ____/____/
mo yr

41. Do you have any children? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 43)

19- 42. How many of them are living with you? _____
(number)

20- 43. With whom do you live now, that is, who are the adults in your household? Give me their relationship to you, not their names. (CIRCLE)

1 Both parents
2 Father only
3 Mother only
21- 4 Wife only
5 Live alone
6 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

44. Where does the money that you live on now come from? Does money for your food, living place, clothes and other expenses come from . . . (HAND CARD 3. READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. CIRCLE LETTERS OF ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE FOR ALL SOURCES OF INCOME.)

22A- A. Earnings of father and/or mother

23B- B. Welfare payments to father and/or mother

24C- C. Other income of father and/or mother (DESCRIBE) _____

25D- D. Earnings of wife

26E- E. Welfare payments to yourself or wife

27F F. Other income of wife (DESCRIBE) _____

28G- G. Your own earnings

29H- H. Your own other income (DESCRIBE) _____

30I- I. Other (DESCRIBE) _____

31 45. What is your major source of support? (UNDERLINE ONE CATEGORY ABOVE)

(RETRIEVE CARD 3)

32- 46. Have you ever been in any branch of the military service? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 50)

33,34- 47a. When were you in the service? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

35- 47b. Did you enlist or were you drafted:

1 Enlisted
2 Drafted

36- 48. Did you have any vocational training while you were in the service? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 51)

37- 49. What kind of work were you trained to do? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

38- 50. What is your draft classification now? _____

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

51. Since leaving school, have you had any part-time or full-time jobs? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 74)

39,40- 52. How many jobs have you had? _____ (number)

41- 53. Would you give us some information about the first job you had? What kind of work did you do? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

42- 54. How many hours a week did you work?
OR
(How many hours per day _____ and how many days per week _____?)

43,44, 45- 55. What was your highest rate of pay? $_____ per hour, or $_____ per week.

46,47- 56. What date did you begin that job? ____/____/ mo yr

57. Are you still employed there?

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 60)
2 No

48,49- 58. What was the date the job ended? ____/____/ mo yr

50- 59. (HAND CARD 4) Which of these was the main reason why you left that job? (READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. CIRCLE ONLY ONE REASON)

1 The job ended
2 Was fired
3 Returned to school or entered a training program
4 Entered military service
5 Moved
6 Was jailed
7 Was sick or in the hospital
8 Left for other reasons (WHY?) _____

_____

(RETRIEVE CARD 4)

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

51- 60. How did you hear about this job? (CIRCLE RESPONSE NUMBER)

1 Public Employment Service
2 Private employment agency
3 Friends
4 Family and other relatives, family friends
5 School
6 Previous employer
7 Neighborhood Center or Opportunity Center
8 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus
9 Went to place of employment and asked about a job
10 NYC, MDTA, OIC, Job Corps or some other training program
11 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

52- 61. If you were asked to rate how much you liked that job, using the numbers 1 to 5, and choosing 5 meant you liked it very much and choosing 1 meant you hated it, which number from 1 to 5 would you choose to show how you feel about that job? (CIRCLE NUMBER)

Hated it				Liked it very much
1	2	3	4	5

53- 62. Why do you say that? _____

_____

_____

63. Did you say you were still working at that same first job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 74)
2 No

54- 64. Now would you tell us about the job you have now or the last job you had? What kind of work did you do? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

55- 65. How many hours a week did you work? _____
OR
(How many hours per day _____ and how many days per week _____?)

56,57, 58- 66. What was your highest rate of pay? $_____ per hour, or $_____ per week.

67. What date did you begin that job? ____/____/
mo yr

68- Are you still employed there?

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 71)
2 No

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

59,60- 69. What was the date your job ended? ____/____/
mo yr

61- 70. If you no longer have this job, which of these was the main reason why you left it? (HAND CARD 4. READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. CIRCLE ONLY ONE REASON)

1 The job ended
2 Was fired
3 Returned to school or entered a training program
4 Entered military service
5 Moved
6 Was jailed
7 Was sick or in the hospital
8 Left for other reasons (WHY?) _____

_____

(RETRIEVE CARD 4)

62- 71. How did you hear about this job? (CIRCLE NUMBER)

1 Public Employment Service
2 Private employment agency
3 Friends
4 Family and other relatives, family friends
5 School
6 Previous employer
7 Neighborhood Center or Opportunity Center
8 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus
9 Went to place of employment and asked about a job
10 NYC, MDTA, OIC, Job Corps or some other training program
11 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

63- 72. If you were asked to rate how much you like that job, using the numbers 1 to 5, and choosing 5 meant you liked it very much and choosing 1 meant you hated it, which number from 1 to 5 would you choose to show how you feel about the job? (CIRCLE NUMBER)

Hated it				Liked it very much
1	2	3	4	5

64- 73. Why do you say that? _____

_____

_____

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

74. (HAND CARD 5) People have many different ways of looking for jobs. When you are looking for a job, which of the ways on that list have you used? Have you: (READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. PROBE FOR ALL METHODS. CIRCLE LETTERS OF ALL THOSE MENTIONED.)

65A- A. Asked your friends about jobs they might know about.

66B- B. Asked your family, other relatives or family friends about jobs they might know about.

67C- C. Checked local newspaper ads.

68D- D. Checked out-of-town newspaper ads.

69E- E. Private employment agencies

70F- F. Checked at State Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center.

71G- G. Applied directly at local company hiring gate or personnel office where you heard they were hiring.

72H- H. Went to local hiring gate or personnel office of companies to see if they were hiring.

73I- I. Applied at companies outside the city.

74J- J. Other ways of looking for jobs (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

(RETRIEVE CARD 5)

75,76, 77- 75. When you're looking for a new job, do you have some hourly wage or weekly salary that you won't go below--that is, what is the lowest wage per hour that you would accept? $____ per hour.

DECK 3

1-6-

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

76. (HAND CARD 6) Now, I'd like to know about your activities, that is, work, school, etc. since a year ago January. Please use the list on this card and tell me what you were doing the first and second halves of each month. Let's start with January, 1968--what were you doing then? (READ THE CATEGORIES ALOUD. PROBE TO DETERMINE FOR EACH HALF-MONTH PERIOD EXACTLY WHAT RESPONDENT'S STATUS WAS. WRITE NUMBER OF ACTIVITY LISTED BELOW IN APPROPRIATE HALF-MONTH SPACE. THE MAIN ACTIVITY FOR EACH HALF-MONTH SHOULD BE USED. IF TWO ACTIVITIES TOOK EQUAL TIME, WRITE IN BOTH NUMBERS.) EXAMPLE:

1	11

2/8	2/8

7,8- 1 Employed full-time

9,10- 2 Employed part-time

11,12- 3 Had job but not working due to illness, slack time, strike, etc.

13,14- 4 Notemployed, but looking for work

15,16- 5 Not employed, but not looking for work

17,18- 6 In the military service full-time

19,20- 7 In jail

21,22- 8 In school part-time

23,24- 9 In school full-time

25,26- 10 Sick or disabled

27,28- 11 In a manpower training program: On-the-Job training, NYC, CEP, New Careers, MDTA, OIC, or any other

29,30- 12 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

31,32- 1968:

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept

33-

1969:

Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June

34-

35-

36-

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

77. And right now, you are doing what? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

37A- A. Employed full-time

38B- B. Employed part-time

39C- C. Have job but not working due to illness, slack time, strike, etc.

40D- D. Not employed, but looking for work

41E- E. Not employed, but not looking for work

42F- F. In the military service full-time

43G- G. In jail

44H- H. In school part-time

45I- I. In school full-time

46J- J. Sick or disabled

47K- K. In a manpower training program: On-the-Job training, NYC, CEP, New Careers, MDTA, OIC, or any other

48L- L. Other (DESCRIBE) _____

49- (RETRIEVE CARD 6)

50- 78. How do you usually get around the city, that is, do you walk, drive, take the bus or what? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER ONLY)

1 Walk
2 Public transportation (bus, cab, subway, streetcar, trolley, etc.)
3 Own transportation (own car, scooter, motorcycle, etc.)
4 Other private transportation (friend's car, motorcycle, etc.)

51,52
53,54- 79. Last month, what was the longest distance in miles (one-way) that you traveled from home?. _____ (miles)

55- 80. About how often do you travel this far from home? (CIRCLE)

1 Every day
2 About once a week
3 A couple of times a month
4 About once a month
5 Several times a year, or less

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

We are interested in finding out how many people have ever heard of some of the programs that the government has set up to help people. (HAND CARD 7) Here is a list of some of those programs and I'd like you to tell me which ones you have heard of.

56- 81. Have you ever heard of the State Employment Service? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 92)

57- 82. If you wanted to register there, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

58- 83. Can you tell me a little about what it does and who it's for?

* *
(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE)

59- 1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge
* *

60- 84. Have you ever registered at the State Employment Service? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 89)

85. (HAND CARD 8) After you registered, did the Employment Service: (READ ALL CATEGORIES ALOUD SLOWLY. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

61A- A. Refer you to an employer for a job

62B- B. Give you any kind of test

63C- C. Give you any kind of counseling

64D- D. Help prepare you for a job interview

65E- E. Refer you to any training program (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

66F- F. Other (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

67G- G. Nothing happened

(RETRIEVE CARD 8)

68-

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

69- 86. Did you ever get a job through the State Employment Service? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

87. Did you get help in ony other way from the State Employment Service?

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 89)

70- 88. What kind of help? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

71- 89. How did you hear about the State Employment Service? (CIRCLE)

1 Friends
2 Family, other relatives or family friends
3 School
4 Neighborhood Center
5 Ads or announcements--newspapers, radio, TV, bus
6 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

72- 90. What is it about the State Employment Service that might make a person want to use it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

73- 91. What is it about the State Employment Service that might make a person not want to use it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

74- 92. Have you ever heard of the Youth Opportunity Center, the YOC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 103)

75- 93. If you wanted to register there, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

76- 94. Can you tell me a little about what it does and who it's for?

* *

(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE.)

77- 1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

DECK 4

1-6-

7- 95. Have you ever registered at the Youth Opportunity Center? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 100)

96. (HAND CARD 8) After you registered, did the Youth Opportunity Center: (READ ALL CATEGORIES ALOUD SLOWLY. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

8A- A. Refer you to an employer for a job

9B- B. Give you any kind of test

10C- C. Give you any kind of counseling

11D- D. Help prepare you for a job interview

12E- E. Refer you to any training program (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

13F- F. Other (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

14G- G. Nothing happened

15- (RETRIEVE CARD 8)

16- 97. Did you ever get a job through the Youth Opportunity Center? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

98. Did you get help in any other way from the Youth Opportunity Center? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 100)

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

17- 99. What kind of help? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

18- 100. How did you hear about the Youth Opportunity Center? (CIRCLE)

1 Friends
2 Family, other relatives or family friends
3 School
4 Neighborhood Center
5 Ads or announcements--newspapers, radio, TV, bus
6 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

19- 101. What is it about the Youth Opportunity Center that might make a person want to use it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

20- 102. What is it about the Youth Opportunity Center that might make a person not want to use it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

21- 103. Have you ever heard of the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 114)

22- 104. If you wanted to apply for the In-School NYC, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

23- 105. Can you tell me a little about what it does and who it's for?

* *

(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE.)

24-

1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

106. Did you ever think about applying for the In-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 111)

107. Did you ever actually apply for the In-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 111)

25- 108. Have you ever been enrolled in the In-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 111)

26,27- 109. What were the dates that you were enrolled in it? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

28- 110. Do you feel that the training and experience you got through NYC helped you to get a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

29- 111. How did you hear about the In-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus
7 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

30- 112. What is it about the In-School NYC that might make a person want to get into it? _____

_____

_____

31- 113. What is it about the In-School NYC that might make a person not want to get into it? _____

_____

_____

32- 114. Have you ever heard of the Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 125)

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

33- 115. If you wanted to apply for the Out-of-School NYC, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

34- 116. Can you tell me a little about what it does and who it's for?

* *

(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE)

35- 1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

117. Have you ever thought about applying for the Out-of-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 122)

118. Have you ever actually applied for the Out-of-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 122)

36- 119. Have you ever been enrolled in the Out-of-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 122)

37,38- 120. What were the dates that you were enrolled in it? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

39- 121. Do you feel that the training and experience you got through the Out-of-School NYC helped you to get a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

40- 122. How did you hear about the Out-of-School NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspapers, radio, TV, bus
7 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

41- 123. What is it about the Out-of-School NYC that might make a person want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

42- 124. What is it about the Out-of-School NYC that might make a person not want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

43- 125. Have you ever heard of the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 128)

44- 126. If you wanted to apply for the Job Corps would you know where to go or what to do? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

45- 127. Can you tell me a little about what the Job Corps does and who it's for?

* *

(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGANCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE.)

46- 1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

128. Have you ever thought about applying for the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 133)

129. Have you ever actually applied for the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 133)

47- 130. Have you ever been enrolled in the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 133)

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

48,49- 131. What were the dates that you were enrolled in it? ____/____/ To ____/____/ (mo yr mo yr)

50- 132. Do you feel that the training and experience you got through the Job Corps helped you to get a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

51- 133. How did you hear about the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus
7 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

52- 134. What is it about the Job Corps that might make a person want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

53- 135. What is it about the Job Corps that might make a person not want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

54- 136. Have you ever heard of the Manpower Development and Training Program, the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 147)

55- 137. If you wanted to apply for the MDTA, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

56- 138. Can you tell me something about what it does and who it's for?

* *

(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE.)

57-
1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

139. Have you ever thought about applying for the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 144)

140. Have you ever actually applied for the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 144)

58- 141. Have you ever been enrolled in the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 144)

59,60- 142. What were the dates that you were enrolled in the MDTA? ____/____/ To ____/____
mo yr mo yr

61- 143. Do you feel that the training and experience you got helped you to get a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

62- 144. How did you hear about the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 State Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus
7 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

63- 145. What is it about the MDTA that might make a person want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

64- 146. What is it about the MDTA that might make a person not want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

65- 147. Have you ever heard of the New Careers Program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 158)

66- 148. If you wanted to apply for the New Careers Program, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

67- 149. Can you tell me a little about what the New Careers Program does and who it's for?

* *
(ON BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, FORM JUDGMENT OF WHETHER HE UNDERSTANDS WHICH AGENCY IS IN QUESTION. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSION OF RESPONDENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY. CIRCLE.)

1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Confused, unclear or no knowledge

* *

150. Have you ever thought about applying for the New Careers Program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 155)

151. Have you ever actually applied for the New Careers Program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 155)

69- 152. Have you ever been enrolled in New Careers? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 155)

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

70,71- 153. What were the dates that you were enrolled in it? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

72- 154. Do you feel that the training and experience you got in New Careers helped you to get a job? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

73- 155. How did you hear about New Careers? (CIRCLE)

1 Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspapers, radio, TV, bus
7 Other (DESCRIBE) _____

74- 156. What is it about the New Careers Program that might make a person want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

75- 157. What is it about the New Careers Program that might make a person not want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

(RETRIEVE CARD 7)

For Office Use Only

DECK 5

1-6-

(HAND CARD 9) Now I'd like to get your reactions to some things that people have different opinions on. I'll read a statement and I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or strongly disagree with it. (READ EACH STATEMENT. CIRCLE NUMBER.)

7- 158. It is better to live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

8- 159. Most work is dull and boring.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

9- 160. You feel that your chances of having a happy home life in the future are good.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

10- 161. You feel that so far in your life you have been very lucky.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

11- 162. When people "bug" you, they should be told off even if it means getting into trouble.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

12- 163. You would say that you have a lot of confidence in yourself.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

For Office Use Only

DECK 5

13- 164. Most of your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

14- 165. Most people cannot be trusted.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

15- 166. If you try hard enough, you have a good chance of succeeding in whatever you want to do.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

16- 167. You feel you are as capable and as smart as most other people.

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree somewhat
3 Disagree somewhat
4 Strongly disagree

(RETRIEVE CARD 9)

Now, let's go back to talking a little more about your family.

17- 168. Would you say that what your family expected of you while you were growing up was: (READ ALTERNATIVES ALOUD AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 Too much
2 A great deal
3 Just about the right amount
4 Not very much
5 Not enough

18- 169. Would you say that in dealing with you, your family was: (READ ALTERNATIVES ALOUD AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 Always fair
2 Usually fair
3 Sometimes fair and sometimes unfair
4 Usually unfair
5 Always unfair

For Office Use Only

DECK 5

19- 170. On the whole, how strict was your family with you? (READ ALTERNATIVES ALOUD AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Too strict
2 Quite strict
3 Just about right
4 Rather easy
5 Too easy

20- 171. Would you say that your (PARENTS OR OTHER) were very interested, somewhat interested, or not at all interested in what you were doing while you were growing up? (CIRCLE)

1 Very interested
2 Somewhat interested
3 Not at all interested

21- 172. While you were growing up, when family decisions were made that concerned you, how often did they pay attention to what you wanted? (READ ALTERNATIVES AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 Always
2 Usually
3 Sometimes
4 Seldom
5 Never

22- 173. When you dropped out of school, would you say that your (PARENTS OR OTHER) were in favor, were opposed, or didn't care one way or the other? (CIRCLE)

1 Were in favor
2 Were opposed
3 Didn't care
4 Divided opinion (VOLUNTEERED BY RESPONDENT)

23- 174. Compared to most of the young men who are your friends, do you feel that you are getting along now: (READ ALTERNATIVES AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 Much better than they are
2 A little better than they are
3 About the same
4 Not as well as they are
5 Much worse than they are

24- 175. Would you say that most of these friends: (READ ALTERNATIVES AND CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 Graduated from high school
2 Dropped out after 10th grade
3 Dropped out before finishing 10th grade

For Office Use Only

DECK 5

25- 176. How many of these friends would you say have full-time jobs: All of them, most of them, some of them, only a few, or none of them? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.)

1 All of them
2 Most of them
3 Some of them
4 Only a few
5 None of them

26- 177. What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?

27- _____

28- 178. Do you think your chances of getting that kind of work are: Very good, fairly good, not so good, or unlikely? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Very good
2 Fairly good
3 Not so good
4 Unlikely

29- 179. Is there anything that might hold you back from getting that kind of work? (CIRCLE LETTER)

A. Yes (IF "YES," DESCRIBE) _____

_____

_____

B. No

180 180. Now we might want to get in touch with you again. Would you give me your telephone number, please? _____

181. The telephone is listed under whose name? _____

182 182. What is your Social Security number ___ ___ ___/___ ___/___ ___ ___ ___/

Now, let me just check back through this to be sure I didn't miss anything . . . (CHECK PAGE BY PAGE TO MAKE SURE ALL QUESTIONS WERE COVERED.)

Your participation in our survey is appreciated very much and we thank you for your time and help

(TIME INTERVIEW ENDED ____:____ a.m.

____:____ p.m.)

For Office Use Only

DECK 5

INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS

30- 183. Sex of respondent: (CIRCLE)

1 Male
2 Female

31- 184. Ethnic origin: (CIRCLE)

1 Negro
2 Caucasian
3 Mexican-American
4 Puerto Rican
5 Other (SPECIFY) _____

32- 185. Does respondent have any obvious physical defects which might impair his ability to work? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes (IF "YES," DESCRIBE) _____
2 No

33- 186. Rating of respondent's attitude toward interview: (CIRCLE)

1 Friendly, cooperative
2 Casual, impersonal
3 Suspicious, reluctant
4 Hostile
5 Totally detached, noninvolved

34- 187. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS: Describe anything that occurred during the interview (interruptions, etc.) which you think may have influenced the accuracy or completeness with which the respondent answered the questions.

35,36-

37-

38,39-

_____
(interviewer)

_____
(date)

THIS INFORMATION IS BEING OBTAINED AS PART OF A RESEARCH STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, AND THE INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

APPENDIX B

MANPOWER SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

A. Baltimore, Maryland

1. Maryland State Employment Service (MSES, ES)

Office Locations:	1100 N. Eutaw Cherry Hill Office--2700 Spelman Rd. 2434 Greenmount Avenue Outreach Centers
Eligibility Requirements:	In need of work or training, over age 16. Veterans are given preference
Services Provided:	Counseling, job referral, referral to training programs, follow-up services by a community worker.

Information about the program is disseminated through the mass media, contact with agencies; outreach workers talk to people in their neighborhoods.

2. Youth Opportunity Center (YOC)

Office Location:	1727 N. Charles Street All outreach centers
Eligibility Requirements:	In need of work or training, age 16 to 21. Any young veteran.
Services Provided:	Applicants are registered, tested, counseled, referred, and followed-up. Sessions for young people to learn about jobs in industry. Enroll youth for work-training courses. Uses neighborhood workers and helps them into college-study programs.

Information about the program is disseminated through the school, the use of TV and radio spots, newspaper ads, hand bills, and through personal contacts in the neighborhoods by outreach workers.

3. Job Corps (JC)

Enrollment Location:	currently--Health and Welfare Council 1310 N. Calvert St. 1966--City Hall

Job Corps (cont.)

Eligibility Requirements:	Age 16-22; of low income family and/or on welfare; usually less than a high school education; without too extensive criminal record (non-repetitive); U.S. citizen; can't have 1A draft status; must have parental consent; must be willing to leave home to live in rural or urban residential center elsewhere.
Number of Job Corps recruits from Baltimore as of June 30, 1969:	3,500 males
Services Provided:	Vocational training, basic education, social and attitudinal enrichment in urban and conservation centers. Remuneration is usually $80.00 per mo.; $50.00 is banked and paid to Corpsmen upon completion of training and an additional $30.00 is paid monthly for personal expenses. Personal achievement may result in increase from $30.00 to a maximum of $50.00 per month. Corpsmen also receive room and board and clothing allowance.

Information about the Job Corps is disseminated through mass media, contact with other agencies, and positive recruitment directly in the neighborhood.

4. Job Corps Skills Center

Location:	Mt. Royal Avenue and Calvert Street Opened June, 1968
Eligibility Requirements:	Resident of Maryland. Baltimore residents live at home; Baltimore non-residents are housed. Other requirements are the same for the regular Job Corps.
Number enrolled, June 30, 1969:	200
Services Provided:	Training in culinary arts, manufacturing orientation, knowledge of plant operation. Hours are 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Stipend is the same as the regular Job Corps.

5. Manpower Development Training Program (MDTA)

Enrollment Locations:	Maryland State Employment Service 1100 N. Eutaw Youth Opportunity Center 1727 N. Charles Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) Calvert and North Avenue Greenmount Avenue Office 2434 Greenmount Avenue Cherry Hill Office 2700 Spelman Road All Outreach Offices
Eligibility Requirements:	Unemployed or under-employed and over age 16.
Services Provided:	Vocational training, basic and remedial education for those who need it. Remuneration--training allowance.

Information about MDTA is disseminated through newspaper publicity and flyer distributions to all social agencies.

(ADDITIONAL INFORMATION) Maryland State Employment Service (MSES, ES)

Current Office Locations:

Mayor's Station, City Hall
Room 123
100 Holiday Street

Mayor's One-Stop Station
2133 W. Pratt Street

Mayor Govans' Station
5227 York Road

Mayor's Station--Coldspring
3006 W. Coldspring Lane

Echo House
1705 W. Fayette Street

Southwest Christian Parrish
410 S. Monroe Street

Lafayette Square Community Center
1002 W. Lanvale Street

Washington Blvd.
788 Washington Blvd.

Essex--Middle River
1515 Martin Blvd.

Dunbar Center
Caroline & McElderry Streets

Hilton Center
125 Hilton Street

Towson
311 E. Pennsylvania Ave.

New Careers

Office Location:

Concentrated Employment Program
Calvert & North Avenue
(Other components of the Concentrated Employment Program are NYC, OIC, Child Care Center, and Special Impact. New Careers is allowed to take 10% youths over 18 into the training program).

New Careers (cont.)

Eligibility Requirements:	Over age 22, resident of a target area with income on the poverty level, 8th grade functional level (optional).
Number Currently Enrolled:	24 males, 70 females
Services Provided:	Program began in October, 1967. Services include on-the-job training, educational preparation (in a college) for high school equivalency diploma (can receive two years of college credits besides on-the-job training if they have high school diploma). New Careers contract with user agencies (hospitals, non-profit and governmental agencies) assures a job plus a career ladder will be available to those enrollees who finish the program. In training, enrollees receive $1.60 per hour, $3.00 per week for transportation costs, plus fringe benefits. They work an 8 hour day. When training is completed, they become regular employees of the user agency and pay is increased.

Means of disseminating information about New Careers is through the mass media and public speaking engagements.

(ADDITIONAL INFORMATION) Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC-OS)

Current Enrollment Sites:	2510 St. Paul Street Application for NYC can be processed at the Department of Employment Security, but then are referred to 2510 St. Paul St. 1966 Enrollment site: 202 Gillford Avenue
Eligibility Requirements:	Member of low-income family; age 16-21; out of school for at least 3 months of the regular school year; city resident.

Out-of-School NYC (cont.)

Enrollment, December, 1966:	496 males, 849 females
Enrollment, June, 1969:	127 males, 782 females
Services Provided:	Work training and experience at the job sites; counseling services; remedial education program, cultural, recreational and educational enrichment program; job development and placement; medical service, family planning services; other services as individual problems and needs identified. Services in each field have expanded since 1966.
Hours worked per week:	Approximately 25-32
Hourly wage:	1966: $1.25 Currently: $1.40

Information about the program is disseminated through radio, TV, bus posters, flyers, newspapers, word of mouth.

In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC)

Eligibility Requirements:	Between ages 16 and 21, currently enrolled in school, and from a low income family as indicated by federal government guidelines. In the summer program, because of more requests from male enrollees than there are applicants, the age requirement for males is 14 to 21.
Services Provided:	Dental and health care and treatment; Secretarial workshops; job placement for graduates; enrichment programs, including trips in and out of state, visits to colleges, places of interest, and places offering career opportunities.

In-School NYC (cont.)

Hours Worked:	For the summer program, the hours worked previously were 32 per week; currently, 28 hours per week.
Hourly Wage:	Initially was $1.25; increased to $1.30; and currently, $1.40.

Information about the NYC is disseminated by sending staff members to the public schools, CAA Centers, neighborhood agencies, and non-profit organizations. Also through local news media. Recruitment is by direct contact through mail, phone, or visits.

B. St. Louis, Missouri

1. Missouri State Employment Service (MSES, MS Employment Office)

Office Locationa:	Missouri State - 505 Washington Kinloch Office - 5737 Carson Road Work Incentive Program - 711 Euclid
Eligibility Requirement:	In need of work or training, over age 16
Services Provided:	Job placement, testing, counseling, referrals to the various training programs

2. Youth Opportunity Center (YOC)

Office Locations:	505 Washington 3817 Olive
Eligibility Requirements:	Under age 21, unemployed and in need of work or training
Services Provided:	Job referrals for youth under 21. Referrals to training programs. Testing, counseling and job placement.

3. In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC, The In-School program)

Programs in fall of 1966 no longer operating:
McKinley High, 2156 Russell
O'Fallon Technical High, 5101 Northrop

Programs Currently Operating:	Beaumont High - 3836 Natural Bridge Central High - 3616 N. Garrison Kinloch High - 5929 Witt Kirkwood (R-7) - 801 Essix Lincoln Opportunity School - 5017 Washington Mercy High - 1000 Pennsylvania Solden High - 918 Union Sumner High - 4248 W. Cottage Vashon High - 2405 Bell
Eligibility Requirements:	A member of low-income family, attending school, not less than 14 years of age, and in need of paid work experience in order to continue in school.

In-School NYC (cont.)

Information about the program is disseminated by: advertising through school media, public media, use of records of the school counselor and school social worker.

Number in program, December, 1966 : 203 males, 348 females
Number currently in summer program : estimated 3,000

Services provided:	Paid work experience in non-profit or Federal agencies; counseling, educational, vocational, cultural and enrichment programs.
Hours worked per week:	1966 - 12 hours per week $1.10 per hour 1969 - 10 hours per week $1.25 per hour

4. Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC, the Youth Corps, Out-of-School Program)

Enrollment sites:	At any of the Neighborhood Action Centers located throughout St. Louis; Missouri State Employment Service -- 505 Washington Avenue; At any worksite where an NYC Counselor has an office; In October, 1966, the Youth Opportunity Office was the major referral agency for enrollees. A small amount of enrollment was done directly by the NYC staff.
Eligibility Requirements:	Age 16 through 21; unemployed; out of school for at least three months of a normal school year and not planning to return to school; in need of useful work experience; and a member of a family with income below the poverty level.

Enrollment in December, 1966 : 456 males, 526 females
Enrollment in June, 1969: 80 males, 360 females

Information about the program is disseminated through mass media.

Services Provided:	Paid work experience, basic and remedial education, counseling and guidance, job placement, follow-up and supportive services in the form of development of occupational competence, dealing with personal, family and social problems.

5. New Careers

Office Locations: St. Louis Community Center (Yalem)
724 N. Union Boulevard

The program began in August, 1967, and recruitment is done by the Missouri State Employment Service.

Eligibility Requirements: 22 years of age or older; unemployed; and an annual family income below the poverty level.

(two more recent requirements): Possession of a high school diploma or the potential for acquiring one within six months after entering the New Careers program; No serious involvement with drugs or alcohol.

Current enrollment: 28 males, 54 females

Information about the program is disseminated by the Neighborhood Centers within the Neighborhood Action Programs.

Services Provided: Enrollees are placed in non-professional jobs which give work experience and an opportunity to further their education and move into a professional position. The position must be designed to improve the health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Most are in the areas of Education Aides, Health Aides, and Casework Aides. The program is actually a job creation effort with major emphasis on access to new careers.

APPENDIX C

MARGINALS

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			1. Where were you born?
0	1	1	Alabama
0	12	12	Arkansas
0	1	1	Florida
0	1	1	Illinois
0	1	1	Indiana
148	0	148	Maryland
0	1	1	Michigan
0	14	14	Mississippi
0	99	99	Missouri
2	0	2	New Jersey
1	0	1	New York
6	0	6	North Carolina
0	1	1	Ohio
0	1	1	Oklahoma
1	0	1	Pennsylvania
9	0	9	South Carolina
0	1	1	Tennessee
9	0	9	Virginia
			2. When were you born?
49.5	49.6	49.6	Mean
1.30	1.15	1.24	Standard Deviation
176	133	309	N
14	6	20	1947, or before
16	15	31	1948
47	29	76	1949
53	53	106	1950
46	30	76	1951
			3. How many years have you lived in this city?
18.1	17.2	17.7	Mean
3.32	4.01	3.66	Standard Deviation
176	133	309	N
3	2	5	2-5 years
7	13	20	6-10 years
8	14	22	11-15 years
138	91	229	16-20 years
20	13	33	21-25 years

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			5. In how many different houses in this city have you lived?
3.9	3.8	3.9	Mean
2.36	2.17	2.27	Standard Deviation
176	131	307	N
14	6	20	One
128	104	232	2-5 houses
32	20	52	6-10 houses
1	1	2	11-15 houses
1	0	1	16-20 houses
0	2	2	Unknown
			7. Months out of school as of 7/1/69.
28.8	25.0	27.2	Mean
5.08	7.46	6.46	Standard Deviation
169	124	293	N
0	5	5	0-6 months
2	4	6	7-12 months
0	8	8	13-18 months
25	30	55	19-24 months
65	53	118	25-30 months
68	18	86	31-36 months
9	6	15	37-42 months
7	9	16	Unknown
			8. Highest school grade completed (first dropout).
9.3	9.8	9.5	Mean
1.28	1.00	1.20	Standard Deviation
173	132	305	N
17	2	19	1-7 grades
29	11	40	8th grade
45	31	76	9th grade
51	53	104	10th grade
31	33	64	11th grade
0	2	2	12th grade
3	1	4	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			9. Reasons for leaving school:
26	5	31	Some subjects too difficult
40	4	44	Wasn't learning anything in school
38	9	47	Didn't get along well with teachers
5	4	9	Didn't get along well with other students
22	52	74	Was suspended or expelled
17	8	25	Parents wanted me to leave, had to help out family
40	21	61	Would rather work than study
89	33	122	Lost interest in school
14	6	20	Wanted to enlist in the military service
8	5	13	Got married and had to support my wife
51	20	71	Didn't have enough money for clothing and other expenses
			Other reasons for leaving school
3	1	4	Other schoolwork reasons
1	2	3	Other school personnel reasons
4	5	9	Other personal and social reasons
1	0	1	Health
5	2	7	Jailed
0	1	1	Moved
5	1	6	Irrelevant and unclear
157	121	278	No other reasons
			10. Main reason for leaving school.
5	2	7	Some subjects too difficult
17	0	17	Wasn't learning anything in school
12	4	16	Didn't get along well with teachers
2	0	2	Didn't get along well with other students
15	47	62	Was suspended or expelled
14	5	19	Parents wanted me to leave, had to help out family
11	15	26	Would rather work than study
53	24	77	Lost interest in school
5	4	9	Wanted to enlist in the military service
6	5	11	Got married and had to support my wife
19	13	32	Didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses
3	1	4	Other schoolwork reasons
1	2	3	Other school personnel reasons
2	2	4	Other personal and social reasons
1	0	1	Health
5	2	7	Jailed
1	2	3	Moved
3	5	8	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			11. Rating of liking for school.
10	5	15	1 - Hated it
29	13	42	2
70	51	121	3
35	29	64	4
32	34	66	5 - Liked it very much
0	1	1	Unknown
			12. Reasons for like-school rating.
			Negative
11	5	16	Criticism of school value, school subjects, school personnel
13	6	19	Personal, social
20	4	24	Qualified
17	10	27	Reiteration
18	13	31	In-Between
			Positive
35	42	77	Value of school, school subjects, school personnel
15	17	32	Personal, social
5	1	6	Qualified
25	21	46	Reiteration
3	2	5	Unknown
			13. Did what you learn in school help prepare you for a job?
59	63	122	Yes
115	64	179	No
2	6	8	Unknown
			14. What specifically helped you prepare? Academic/Vocational help in preparing for a job.
22	24	46	Academic only
6	9	15	Academic and Vocational
31	27	58	Vocational only
0	3	3	Unknown (no information)
117	70	187	Not applicable (school did not help prepare for a job)

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			14. Vocational help in preparing for job.
22	21	43	Vocational course work only
13	5	18	Vocational behaviors, how to get and keep a job
0	3	3	Social skills, personal development
1	2	3	Vocational courses and vocational behaviors
1	4	5	Vocational courses and social skills
1	1	2	Vocational behaviors and social skills
138	97	235	Unknown and not applicable
			15. Reading ability compared to average high school graduate.
21	22	43	Better than average
28	18	46	Worse than average
127	91	218	Same as average
0	2	2	Unknown
			16. Math ability compared to average high school graduate.
16	15	31	Better than average
63	32	95	Worse than average
97	84	181	Same as average
0	2	2	Unknown
			17. Ever return to full-time school after dropout?
21	25	46	Yes
154	101	255	No
1	7	8	Unknown
			18. 19. Months in full-time school on return.
10	10	20	0 - 6 months
5	6	11	7 - 12 months
0	3	3	13 - 18 months
0	3	3	19 - 24 months
1	0	1	25 or more months
5	3	8	Unknown
155	108	263	Not applicable (No or unknown in 17)

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			20. Highest grade completed on return.
12	6	18	10th grade or less
2	9	11	11th grade
4	9	13	12th grade
3	1	4	Unknown
155	108	263	Not applicable (no or unknown in 17)
			21. Ever try to finish school in special classes?
38	41	79	Yes
135	84	219	No
3	8	11	Unknown
			22. Credits earned in special courses.
34	33	67	No credits earned
1	6	7	1 - 5 credits
1	1	2	6 - 10 credits
0	1	1	11 or more credits
2	0	2	Unknown
			22. Additional grades finished.
29	38	67	None
6	3	9	One
1	0	1	Two
2	0	2	Unknown
			22. Passed GED test?
4	3	7	Yes
32	38	70	No
2	0	2	Unknown
			22. Any other progress in special courses?
35	40	75	No
1	1	2	Yes
2	0	2	Unknown
			22. No progress.
24	27	51	No progress
13	14	27	Some progress
1	0	1	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			23. Any vocational courses outside of full-time school?
12	8	20	Yes
161	120	281	No
3	5	8	Unknown
			24. Number of vocational courses.
10	7	17	One
1	1	2	Two
1	0	1	Three
			25. Kind of work, earliest vocational course.
2	1	3	Semi-professional or technician
3	0	3	Building and construction trades
1	5	6	Metal-working and machine trades
1	1	2	Factory and warehouse work
4	1	5	Service trades
1	0	1	Pre-occupational training
			25. Kind of work, 2nd earliest course.
1	0	1	Machine trades
0	1	1	Food preparation
			25. Kind of work, 3rd earliest course.
1	0	1	Machine trades
			26. Months in earliest vocational course.
10	5	15	1 - 6 months
1	2	3	7 - 12 months
1	1	2	Unknown
			26. Months in 2nd earliest vocational course.
1	0	1	One
0	1	1	37 months
			26. Months in 3rd earliest vocational course.
1	0	1	One

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			27, 28. Complete training? Earliest vocational course.
3	1	4	Completed training, got certificate
2	1	3	Completed training, no certificate
6	6	12	Did not complete training
1	0	1	Unknown
			27, 28. Complete training? Second earliest vocational course.
1	0	1	Did not complete training
0	1	1	Unknown
			27, 28. Complete training? Third earliest vocational course.
1	0	1	Did not complete training
			29. Family unit prior to dropout.
0	1	1	Lived alone
105	75	180	Lived with both father and mother
2	1	3	Father and stepmother, mother and stepfather
3	4	7	Father only
54	38	92	Mother only
5	3	8	Related couples (e.g., grandparents, aunt and uncle)
3	7	10	Female relatives only (e.g., grandmother, aunt)
3	1	4	Foster home
1	3	4	Unknown
			30. Kind of work, principal adult.
0	1	1	Major professional
2	2	4	Lesser professional
1	4	5	Semi-professional
6	10	16	Clerical, Sales
9	2	11	Technicians
16	22	38	Skilled manual
43	29	72	Machine operators
14	8	22	Semi-skilled
54	33	87	Unskilled
24	16	40	None
7	6	13	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			31. Was principal adult working at time of dropout?
136	101	237	Yes
39	27	66	No
1	5	6	Unknown
			32. Highest school grade completed by principal adult.
44	20	64	1 - 7
16	15	31	8
18	5	23	9
26	11	37	10
11	20	31	11
22	23	45	12
4	7	11	High school and additional schooling
2	5	7	College
33	27	60	Unknown
			33. Annual family income year before dropout.
4	4	8	Below $1,000
12	8	20	From $1,000 to $2,000
32	15	47	From $2,000 to $3,000
35	31	66	From $3,000 to $4,000
34	16	50	From $4,000 to $5,000
21	20	41	From $5,000 to $6,000
10	8	18	From $6,000 to $7,000
11	5	16	From $7,000 to $8,000
12	13	25	Above $8,000
5	13	18	Unknown
			34. Number of persons in household at time of dropout.
6.2	6.1	6.2	Mean
2.84	2.44	2.67	Standard Deviation
175	131	306	N
75	61	136	1 - 5
83	65	148	6 - 10
17	5	22	11 - 15
1	2	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			35. Number of persons employed and contributing to income at time of dropout.
1.9	1.8	1.9	Mean
1.15	1.05	1.11	Standard Deviation
175	131	306	N
13	10	23	None
53	40	93	One
75	55	130	Two
17	14	31	Three
14	11	25	Four
3	1	4	Five
1	2	3	Unknown
			36. Up to the time you left school, did your family ever receive welfare payments?
55	34	89	Yes
119	95	214	No
2	4	6	Unknown
			37. About how much of the time did they receive welfare?
18	20	38	All of the time
19	3	22	Most of the time
14	11	25	Some of the time
4	0	4	Only once or twice
119	95	214	Did not receive welfare
2	4	6	Unknown
			38, 39. Marital status at time of interview.
22	20	42	Married, living with wife
5	8	13	Separated
149	103	252	Single, never married
0	2	2	Unknown
			40. Months married as of 7/1/69.
5	10	15	0 - 6 months
3	1	4	Unknown
149	105	254	Never married, or marital status unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			41, 42. Number of children and living with subject.
117	95	212	0 children
29	20	49	Children, none living with subject
16	12	28	1 child, living with subject
6	3	9	2 children
4	0	4	3 children
2	0	2	4 children
2	3	5	Unknown
			43. Family unit at time of interview.
63	40	103	Both parents
3	2	5	Father only
57	50	107	Mother only
12	16	28	Wife only
3	5	8	Live alone
8	2	10	Lives with wife and other adults
12	14	26	Lives with relatives other than parents or wife
3	0	3	Lives in institution, foster home
3	1	4	Lives with unrelated others
11	1	12	Other, jail
1	2	3	Unknown
			44. Sources of support at time of interview.
34	47	81	Earnings of father and/or mother (or principal adult)
10	9	19	Welfare payments to father and/or mother
2	2	4	Other income of father and/or mother
6	4	10	Wife's earnings
2	3	5	Own or wife's welfare payments
123	79	202	Own earnings
6	1	7	Hustling
0	1	1	Training allowance
3	1	4	Unemployment compensation
1	0	1	Disability payments
2	0	2	Help from relatives
13	1	14	Jail maintenance

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			45. Major source of support at time of interview.
40	47	87	Parental family
1	3	4	Wife
1	3	4	Welfare
118	74	192	Own earnings
1	2	3	Hustling
13	1	14	Jail
2	0	2	Other
0	3	3	Unknown
			46. Ever been in military service?
16	14	30	Yes
160	116	276	No
0	3	3	Unknown
			47. Months in military service.
		17.7	Mean
		9.09	Standard Deviation
4	3	7	0 - 6
0	2	2	7 - 12
0	1	1	13 - 18
8	6	14	19 - 24
4	2	6	25 - 30
			47. Enlist or drafted?
9	13	22	Enlisted
7	1	8	Drafted
			43. Any vocational training while in the service?
6	5	11	Yes
10	9	19	No
			49. Kind of work being trained for.
3	1	4	Clerical
0	1	1	Data processing
0	1	1	Machinist
2	0	2	Technician (dental, X-ray assistant)
1	1	2	Cook
0	1	1	Military police work

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			50. What is your draft status now?
33	18	51	None
69	46	115	1A
21	29	50	1Y
19	3	22	4F
2	0	2	2A
1	13	14	1S, 2S, 1SH
3	0	3	1D
8	5	13	3A
0	2	2	5A (error in code description)
15	14	29	In military service
5	3	8	Unknown
			51, 52. Jobs since leaving school.
2.9	2.4	2.8	Mean
2.11	2.43	2.26	Standard Deviation
173	130	303	N
13	28	41	None
136	91	227	1 - 5
23	10	33	6 - 10
1	1	2	11 - 15
3	3	6	Unknown
			53. Kind of work, first job after dropout.
18	8	26	Clerical and Data processing
2	2	4	Sales
8	1	9	Sub-professional
7	11	18	Crafts and Trades
9	13	22	Machine operator
16	6	22	Factory operative
29	23	52	Food preparation and Service
6	2	8	Misc. skilled and semi-skilled
55	35	90	Miscellaneous and Unskilled
4	0	4	Unclear or unspecific
9	4	13	Unknown
13	28	41	Not applicable
			54. Hours per week, first job.
9	11	20	Part-time (less than 35 hours a week)
145	84	229	Full-time (35 hours, or more, a week)
9	10	19	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			55. Highest hourly rate of pay, first job after dropout.
1.72	2.04	1.84	Mean
.61	.33	.72	Standard Deviation
154	98	252	N
42	10	52	$1.39 or less
49	32	81	$1.40 - $1.74
26	15	41	$1.75 - $1.99
18	22	40	$2.00 - $2.49
12	6	18	$2.50 - $2.99
5	6	11	$3.00 - $3.49
1	5	6	$3.50 - $3.99
0	1	1	$4.00 - $4.49
1	1	2	$4.50 and over
9	7	16	Unknown
			56. When first job began, months before 7/1/69.
7	13	20	0 - 6 (included jobs beginning after 7/1/69)
11	14	25	7 - 12
12	18	30	13 - 18
27	17	44	19 - 24
55	15	70	25 - 30
29	8	37	31 - 36
8	2	10	37 - 42
4	3	7	43 or more
10	15	25	Unknown
			57, 58. Months in first job to date of interview.
8.2	6.9	7.7	Mean
8.58	7.81	8.52	Standard Deviation
151	88	239	N
6	1	7	Less than 2 weeks
83	58	146	1 - 6
22	18	40	7 - 12
13	4	17	13 - 18
11	2	13	19 - 24
5	2	7	25 - 30
5	2	7	31 - 36
1	1	2	37 - 48
12	17	29	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			59. Main reason left first job.
23	13	36	The job ended
13	6	19	Was fired
9	6	15	Returned to school or entered training program
4	3	7	Entered military service
1	0	1	Moved
5	6	11	Was jailed
3	4	7	Was sick or in the hospital
51	26	77	Quit job, pay, conditions, personnel
23	16	39	Quit job, other reasons
9	5	14	Unknown
			60. How did you hear about first job?
5	11	16	Public Employment Service
2	0	2	Private employment agency
65	23	93	Friends
28	27	55	Family and other relatives, family friend
2	4	6	School
0	2	2	Previous employer
6	7	13	Neighborhood Center or Opportunity Center
12	4	16	Ads or announcements
28	10	38	Went to place of employment and asked about job
7	6	13	NYC, MDTA, OIC, Job Corps or some other training program
8	6	14	Unknown
			61. Like-work rating, first job.
33	17	50	1 - Hated it
23	15	38	2
28	28	56	3
20	16	36	4
50	24	74	5 - Liked it very much
9	5	14	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			62. Reasons for like-work rating.
			Negative
4	5	9	Unclear, repetitive
24	5	29	Conditions, pay, personnel
33	21	54	Kind of work
2	6	8	Lack of potential for career
18	22	40	Qualified
			Positive
5	3	8	Unclear, repetitive
19	8	27	Conditions, pay, personnel
45	29	74	Kind of work
4	1	5	Career potential
9	5	14	Unknown
			64. Kind of work, most recent job (including first job).
13	7	20	Clerical and data processing
3	2	5	Sales
9	1	10	Sub-professional
12	17	29	Crafts and Trades
12	12	24	Machine operator
22	19	41	Factory and foundry work
12	11	23	Food preparation and service
7	3	10	Misc. skilled and semi-skilled
59	27	86	Miscellaneous and Unskilled
13	28	41	Not applicable (no job)
14	6	20	Unknown
			65. Hours per week, most recent job.
6	4	10	Part-time
146	89	235	Full-time
2	6	8	Unknown
			66. Highest hourly rate of pay, most recent job (other than first).
2.12	2.42	2.23	Mean
.597	.719	.667	Standard Deviation
117	76	193	N

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			69. Months in most recent job as of date of interview.
8.9	5.6	7.6	Mean
9.33	6.31	8.44	Standard Deviation
153	97	250	N
7	5	12	Less than 2 weeks
84	61	145	1 - 6 months
17	20	37	7 - 12 months
18	7	25	13 - 18 months
13	2	15	19 - 24 months
14	2	16	25 or more months
1	2	3	Unknown
			70. Reason no longer have most recent job.
10	8	18	The job ended
8	5	13	Was fired
2	2	4	Returned to school or entered training program
3	1	4	Entered military service
5	1	6	Was jailed
1	2	3	Was sick or in the hospital
18	14	32	Quit job, pay, conditions, personnel
8	10	18	Quit job, other reasons
22	34	56	Unknown
77	22	99	Not applicable
			71. How hear about most recent job.
11	10	21	Public Employment Service
4	0	4	Private employment agency
52	31	83	Friends
31	20	51	Family , other relatives, family friends
2	4	6	School
0	3	3	Previous employer
7	9	16	Neighborhood Center or Opportunity Center
19	2	21	Ads or announcements
21	13	34	Went to place of employment and asked about a job
7	6	13	NYC, MDTA, OIC, Job Corps, other programs
0	1	1	Unknown
			72. Like-work rating, most recent job.
18	11	29	1 - Hated it
14	8	22	2
25	24	49	3
25	25	50	4
71	31	102	5 - Liked it very much
1	0	1	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			73. Reasons for like-work rating.
			Negative
3	1	4	Repetitive and unclear
16	2	18	Conditions, pay, personnel
17	15	32	The work itself
2	3	5	Lack of career potential
13	17	30	Qualified and pro/con
			Positive
0	4	4	Repetitive and unclear
40	14	54	Conditions, pay, personnel
53	38	91	The work itself
8	4	12	Career potential
2	1	3	Unknown
			74. Ways of looking for a job.
108	38	146	Asked friends
75	12	87	Asked family, other relatives, family friends
94	51	145	Checked local newspaper ads
6	2	8	Checked out-of-town newspaper ads
26	4	30	Private employment agencies
68	43	116	State Employment Service, Youth Opportunity Center
52	27	79	Applied directly . . . where heard they were hiring
53	49	102	Went to company to see if they were hiring
5	3	8	Applied to companies outside of city
3	2	5	Other, jail helped to locate job
			75. Lowest acceptable hourly rate of pay.
1.92	2.14	2.01	Mean
.44	.56	.51	Standard Deviation
174	128	302	N
9	3	12	$1.39 or less
51	29	80	$1.40 - $1.74
33	15	48	$1.75 - $1.99
53	42	95	$2.00 - $2.49
20	24	44	$2.50 - $2.99
7	13	20	$3.00 - $3.49
1	1	2	$3.50 - $3.99
0	1	1	$4.50 or more
2	5	7	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			76. Half-months in various activities, 18-month period.[1]
			Employed full-time.
19.2	15.0	17.4	Mean
14.24	13.83	14.20	Standard Deviation
176	130	306	N
30	33	63	None
7	6	13	1 - 2
11	16	27	3 - 6
23	11	34	7 - 12
17	16	33	13 - 18
18	9	27	19 - 24
5	9	14	25 - 30
14	10	24	31 - 35
51	20	71	36
0	3	3	Unknown
			Employed Part-time.
1.2	1.6	1.4	Mean
4.38	5.06	4.68	Standard Deviation
156	103	259	None
2	7	9	1 - 2
8	13	21	3 - 6
4	3	7	7 - 12
2	1	3	13 - 18
2	1	3	19 - 24
2	0	2	25 - 30
0	2	2	31 - 35
0	3	3	Unknown
			Not working, had job but laid off, etc.
0.2	0.0	0.1	Mean
1.46	0.26	1.12	Standard Deviation
169	129	298	None
2	0	2	1 - 2
3	1	4	3 - 6
1	0	1	7 - 12
1	0	1	13 - 18
0	3	3	Unknown

[1] N's throughout Item 76 are the same and are reported only in "Employed full-time."

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			76. Not employed, looking for work.
4.5	6.1	5.2	Mean
8.58	9.53	9.02	Standard Deviation
110	64	174	None
14	15	29	1 - 2
12	14	26	3 - 6
17	9	26	7 - 12
8	11	19	13 - 18
6	6	12	19 - 24
3	7	10	25 - 30
1	2	3	31 - 35
5	2	7	36
0	3	3	Unknown
			Not employed, not looking for work.
2.0	2.6	2.2	Mean
5.31	7.15	6.15	Standard Deviation
138	100	238	None
10	8	18	1 - 2
9	8	17	3 - 6
9	5	14	7 - 12
5	1	6	13 - 18
3	2	5	19 - 24
1	3	4	25 - 30
0	2	2	31 - 35
1	1	2	36
0	3	3	Unknown
			In military service full-time.
2.3	2.3	2.3	Mean
8.23	8.07	8.15	Standard Deviation
161	119	280	None
2	1	3	3 - 6
1	1	2	7 - 12
1	3	4	19 - 24
2	1	3	25 - 30
6	0	6	31 - 35
3	5	8	36
0	3	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			76. In jail.
3.4	1.5	2.7	Mean
9.12	5.39	7.80	Standard Deviation
148	115	263	None
0	2	2	1 - 2
5	4	9	3 - 6
4	3	7	7 - 12
4	2	6	13 - 18
2	0	2	19 - 24
4	3	7	25 - 30
2	1	3	31 - 35
7	0	7	36
0	3	3	Unknown
			In school, part-time.
0.4	0.8	0.6	Mean
2.85	3.38	3.08	Standard Deviation
170	121	291	None
1	1	2	1 - 2
2	1	3	3 - 6
1	5	6	7 - 12
1	0	1	13 - 18
0	2	2	19 - 24
1	0	1	31 - 35
0	3	3	Unknown
			In school, full-time.
1.3	5.0	2.8	Mean
5.49	10.69	8.31	Standard Deviation
164	98	262	None
2	5	7	1 - 2
1	1	2	3 - 6
1	6	7	7 - 12
2	1	3	13 - 18
1	6	7	19 - 24
4	4	8	25 - 30
1	4	5	31 - 35
0	5	5	36
0	3	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			76. Sick or disabled.
0.4	0.1	0.3	Mean
2.20	0.96	1.78	Standard Deviation
166	125	291	None
4	3	7	1 - 2
1	1	2	3 - 6
3	1	4	7 - 12
2	0	2	13 - 18
0	3	3	Unknown
			In manpower training programs.
1.8	1.3	1.6	Mean
5.20	4.31	4.84	Standard Deviation
151	114	265	None
0	2	2	1 - 2
4	4	8	3 - 6
10	5	15	7 - 12
8	2	10	13 - 18
1	2	3	19 - 24
1	1	2	25 - 30
1	0	1	31 - 35
0	3	3	Unknown
			Other activities.
0.1	0.3	0.2	Mean
0.75	2.18	1.53	Standard Deviation
175	127	302	None
0	1	1	1 - 2
1	0	1	7 - 12
0	1	1	13 - 18
0	1	1	19 - 24
0	3	3	Unknown
			Description of other activities.
1	0	1	Expecting to enter training program
1	2	3	On vacation, visiting
0	4	4	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			77. And right now, you are doing what?
96	61	157	Employed full-time
8	6	14	Employed part-time
8	1	9	Had job, laid off
30	37	67	Unemployed, looking for work
8	6	14	Unemployed, not looking for work
2	6	8	In military service, full-time (interviewed subjects)
57	54	111	In military service, full-time (uninterviewed subjects)
18	3	21	In jail (interviewed subjects)
2	13	15	In jail (uninterviewed subjects)
1	2	3	In school, part-time
1	6	7	In school, full-time
4	1	5	Sick or disabled
2	2	4	In manpower programs (interviewed subjects)
1	2	3	In manpower programs (uninterviewed subjects)
5	2	7	Subject deceased
0	1	1	Subject expecting to enter military service
			78. How do you usually get around?
39	19	58	Walk only
99	58	157	Public transportation, and walk
15	35	50	Own transportation, and walk
10	15	25	Other private transportation, and walk
13	6	19	Unknown
			79. Last month, what was the longest distance traveled?
85.7	96.0	90.3	Mean
163.27	209.22	184.65	Standard Deviation
160	126	286	N
33	49	82	5 miles or less
34	17	51	6 - 10
8	14	22	11 - 15
11	10	21	16 - 25
29	6	35	26 - 50
13	5	18	51 - 100
12	6	18	101 - 200
8	8	16	201 - 300
12	11	23	300 or more
16	7	23	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			80. About how often do you travel this far from home?
45	41	86	Every day
17	26	43	About once a week
22	17	39	A couple times a month
26	11	37	About one time a month
48	30	78	Several times a year, or less
18	8	26	Unknown
			81. Have you ever heard of the State Employment Service?
151	117	268	Yes
25	12	37	No
0	4	4	Unknown
			82. If you wanted to register, would you know where?
109	103	212	Yes
42	14	56	No
25	16	41	Not applicable (never heard of SES), and unknown
			83. Information level, SES.
43	34	77	Knows quite a bit about it
86	69	155	Knows only a little about it
22	14	36	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge
			84. Ever registered, SES
55	62	117	Yes
96	55	151	No
			85. ES actions (registered subjects)
23	28	61	Refer to an employer for a job
7	9	16	Give you any kind of test
8	6	14	Give you any kind of counseling
6	1	7	Help prepare you for a job interview
			Refer you to any training program?
0	2	2	NYC
1	1	2	Job Corps
3	4	7	MDTA and other vocational training programs

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			Other ES activities.
6	0	6	Referred to YOC
1	0	1	Unemployment compensation check
1	0	1	Told me to come back
			85. ES activity summary
16	16	32	Nothing happened
29	35	64	One ES activity reported
7	8	15	Two
1	3	4	Three
2	0	2	Four
			36. Ever get a job through ES?
18	23	41	Yes
37	39	76	No
			87, 88. Ever any other kind of help from ES?
1	0	1	Job referral
1	3	4	Training referral
1	0	1	YOC referral
3	2	5	Unemployment compensation
3	0	3	Advice and counsel
46	57	103	None
			89. How . . . hear about SES?
58	50	108	Friends
48	29	77	Family, other relatives or family friends
3	9	12	School
4	8	12	Neighborhood Center
22	18	40	Ads or announcements
3	0	3	YOC
			Combinations
5	0	5	Combination of friends and family
1	0	1	Combination of school and Neighborhood Center
4	1	5	Private and public
3	2	5	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			90. What is there about the SES that might make a person want to use it?
3	6	9	No reason
2	1	3	Convenient location
10	2	12	Free service
78	83	161	Referral effectiveness
14	4	18	Service and experience
13	2	15	Quality of jobs
3	3	6	Reservations
7	4	11	Other
21	12	33	No response
			91. What is there about the SES that might make a person not want to use it?
16	18	34	No reason
18	9	27	Person himself
8	1	9	Location, lack of information
2	0	2	Cost
20	20	40	Time and delay
5	10	15	SES experience
22	14	36	Undesirable or ineffective referral
5	4	9	Other
55	41	96	No response
			92. Have you ever heard of the YOC?
131	103	168	Yes
45	30	75	No
			93. If you wanted to register would you know where to go?
98	70	168	Yes
33	33	66	No
			94. Information level, YOC.
36	25	61	Knows quite a bit about it
72	54	126	Knows only a little about it
23	24	47	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge
			95. Ever register at YOC?
70	51	121	Yes
61	52	113	No

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			96. YOC actions (registered subjects)
45	31	76	Refer you to an employer for a job
12	2	14	Give you any kind of test
18	8	26	Give you any kind of counseling
10	6	16	Help prepare you for a job interview
2	0	2	Refer you to any training program
2	0	2	NYC
0	2	2	Job Corps
5	2	7	MDTA and other vocational training programs
			96. Summary of YOC actions.
9	13	22	Nothing happened
40	30	70	One action reported
14	3	17	Two
5	4	9	Three
1	1	2	Four
1	0	1	Five
			97. Ever get a job through YOC?
41	23	64	Yes
29	28	57	No
			99. Ever any other kind of help from YOC?
2	0	2	Job referral
1	0	1	Training program referrals
2	0	2	Material help
5	2	7	Counsel
0	2	2	Social Security card
60	47	107	No other help reported
			100. How hear about YOC?
57	60	117	Friends
22	7	29	Family, other relatives, family friends
8	10	18	School
3	7	10	Neighborhood Center
26	10	36	Ads or announcements
			Combinations
3	1	4	Private (friends and family)
10	5	15	Private and public
2	3	5	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			101. What is there about the YOC that might make a person want to use it?
1	2	3	No reasons
3	0	3	Free service
32	56	88	Jobs, referral effectiveness
18	7	25	YOC service and experience
9	1	10	Quality of jobs
27	11	38	Youth specialization
6	2	8	Reservations
18	4	22	Confusions
1	0	1	Other
16	20	36	No response
			102. What is there about the YOC that might make a person not want to use it?
18	9	27	No reason
10	10	20	The person himself
1	0	1	Location, lack of information
9	11	20	Time and delay
5	4	9	YOC experience
36	13	49	Undesirable or ineffective job referral
1	1	2	Other
1	0	1	Confusion
50	55	105	No response
			103. Ever heard of the In-School NYC?
52	57	109	Yes
124	72	196	No
0	4	4	Unknown
			104. If you wanted to apply, would you know where to go?
29	36	65	Yes
23	21	44	No
			105. Information level, In-School NYC.
17	11	28	Knows quite a bit about it
15	25	40	Knows only a little about it
20	21	41	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			106, 107, 108. Did you ever think about applying? Ever actually apply? Ever been enrolled?
10	10	20	Enrolled
4	3	7	Applied, but did not enroll
4	2	6	Thought about it, but did not apply
34	42	76	Never thought about applying
			109. Months in In-School NYC (enrollee subjects)
6	8	14	0 - 6 months
1	1	2	7 - 12 months
2	0	2	19 - 24 months
1	1	2	Unknown
			110. Did In-School NYC help you get a job?
6	9	15	Yes
4	1	5	No
			111. How did you hear about the In-School NYC?
2	0	2	Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
20	23	43	Friends
2	2	4	Family, other relatives, family friends
11	24	35	School
3	2	5	Neighborhood Center
7	2	9	Ads or announcements
6	3	9	Private and public
1	1	2	Unknown
			112. What is there about the In-School NYC that might make a person want to get into it?
0	1	1	No reason
9	11	20	Pay
5	4	9	NYC work and working conditions
10	11	21	Educational opportunity
12	11	23	Employment and career opportunity
2	1	3	Other
14	18	32	No response

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			113. What is there about the In-School NYC that might make a person not want to get into it?
12	11	23	No reason
4	1	5	The person himself
9	5	14	The pay
0	4	4	Work and working conditions
4	7	11	Other drawbacks to in-school NYC
23	29	52	No response
			114. Ever heard of the Out-of-School NYC?
46	36	82	Yes
130	94	224	No
0	3	3	Unknown
			115. If you wanted to apply, would you know where to go?
25	30	55	Yes
21	6	27	No
			116. Information level, Out-of-School NYC.
13	7	20	Knows quite a bit about it
17	18	35	Knows only a little about it
16	11	27	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge
			117, 118, 119. Did you ever think about applying? Ever actually apply? Ever been enrolled?
9	3	12	Enrolled
3	4	7	Applied but did not enroll
3	2	5	Thought about it, but did not apply
31	25	56	Never thought about applying
0	2	2	Unknown
			120. Months in Out-of-School NYC (enrollee subjects).
2	2	4	0 - 6 months
5	1	6	7 - 12 months
1	0	1	13 - 18 months
1	0	1	Unknown
			121. Did Out-of-School NYC help you get a job?
6	3	9	Yes
3	0	3	No

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			122. How did you hear about Out-of-School NYC?
3	4	7	Public Employment Service, or Youth Opportunity Center
24	16	40	Friends
4	1	5	Family, other relatives, family friends
3	7	10	School
4	4	8	Neighborhood Center
6	3	9	Ads or announcements
0	1	1	Public Employment Service, School, and Neighborhood Center
2	0	2	Public and private
			123. What is there about the Out-of-School NYC that might make a person want to get into it?
1	0	1	Nothing
1	3	4	Pay only
11	9	20	The work
15	9	24	Career, personal development
2	2	4	NYC environment
5	2	7	Negative or conditional
2	1	3	Confusion
9	10	19	No response
			124. What is there about the Out-of-School NYC that might make a person not want to get into it?
4	6	10	No reason
3	5	8	The person himself
9	3	12	Pay only
3	0	3	NYC work, employment
4	2	6	NYC environment and conditions
1	1	2	Career, personal development
1	1	2	Confusion
21	18	39	No response
			125. Ever heard of the Job Corps?
170	128	298	Yes
6	2	8	No
0	3	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			126. If you wanted to apply, would you know where to go?
97	80	177	Yes
73	48	121	No
			127. Information level, Job Corps.
57	45	102	Knows quite a bit about it
73	53	136	Knows only a little about it
34	24	58	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge
1	1	2	Unknown
			128, 129, 130. Ever think about applying? Ever actually apply? Ever been enrolled?
16	13	29	Enrolled
8	8	16	Applied, but did not enroll
39	12	51	Thought about it, but did not apply
105	94	199	Never thought about applying
2	1	3	Unknown
			131. Months in the Job Corps (enrollee subjects)
13	9	22	0 - 6 months
2	1	3	7 - 12 months
1	2	3	13 - 18 months
0	1	1	Unknown
			132. Did Job Corps help you get a job?
3	8	11	Yes
13	5	18	No
			133. How did you hear about Job Corps?
10	12	22	Public Employment Service, Youth Opportunity Center
70	58	128	Friends
17	7	24	Family, other relatives, family friends
4	2	6	School
7	8	15	Neighborhood Center
45	38	83	Ads or announcements
3	2	5	Friends and family
1	0	1	Public Employment Service, School, and Neighborhood Center
12	1	13	Private and Public
1	0	1	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			134. What is there about the Job Corps that might make a person want to get into it?
0	8	8	No reason
33	16	49	Getting and being away from home
8	4	12	Pay, earn and learn
70	55	125	Vocational training, general "opportunity"
9	6	15	Job Corps experience
15	14	29	Career value of training
4	0	4	Dropout specialization
2	0	2	Placement only
1	0	1	Vocational counseling
1	2	3	Other
27	23	50	No response
			135. What is there about the Job Corps that might make a person not want to get into it?
12	7	19	No reason
19	3	22	The person himself
49	40	89	Getting and being away from home
16	7	23	Pay, hours, delay
13	9	22	Job Corps experience
2	8	10	Value of training
1	2	3	Other
58	52	110	No response
			136. Ever heard of the MDTA?
48	55	103	Yes
128	75	203	No
0	3	0	Unknown
			137. If you wanted to apply, would you kn. where to go?
31	33	64	Yes
17	22	39	No

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			138. Information level, MDTA.
10	14	24	Knows quite a bit about it
15	20	35	Knows only a little about it
23	20	43	Confused, unclear, or no knowledge
0	1	1	Unknown
			139, 140, 141. Ever thought about applying? Ever actually applied? Ever been enrolled?
8	5	13	Enrolled
3	2	5	Applied, but did not enroll
6	8	14	Thought about it but did not apply
29	40	69	Never thought about applying
2	0	2	Unknown
			142. Months in MDTA, enrollee subjects.
7	5	12	0 - 6 months
1	0	1	7 - 12 months
			143. Did MDTA help you get a job?
6	3	9	Yes
2	1	3	No
0	1	1	Unknown
			144. How did you hear about MDTA?
3	5	8	State Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
20	25	45	Friends
3	4	7	Family, other relatives, family friends
1	4	5	School
3	3	6	Neighborhood Center
12	9	21	Ads or announcements
3	1	4	Friends, and family
2	3	5	Private and public
1	1	2	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			145. What is there about the MDTA that might make a person want to get into it?
0	1	1	No reason
7	6	13	Pay, earn and learn
11	19	30	Vocational training, general opportunity
3	1	4	MDTA experience
4	7	11	Career value of training, placement
4	2	6	Specialized clientele
19	19	38	No response
			146. What is there about the MDTA that might make a person not want to get into it?
3	10	13	No reason
3	4	7	The person himself
1	0	1	Lack of information, poor information
8	7	15	Pay, conditions
6	3	9	MDTA experience
27	31	58	No response
			147. Ever hear of New Careers?
5	4	9	Yes
171	129	300	No
			148. If you wanted to apply, would you know where to go?
3	2	5	Yes
2	2	4	No
			155. How did you hear about New Careers?
2	0	2	Friends
2	1	3	Family
1	0	1	School
0	2	2	Neighborhood Center
0	1	1	Ads
			156. What is there about the New Careers that might make a person want to get into it?
2	2	4	"They help you find a good job," "it finds you a job making good money," "a lot of money to be made," "security in the future"
3	2	5	No response

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			157. What is there about New Careers that might make a person not want to get into it?
1	2	3	"the person himself," "they don't pay you anything while they train you," "no reason"
4	2	6	No response
			158. It is better to live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
62	44	106	Strongly agree
41	17	58	Agree somewhat
27	22	49	Disagree somewhat
46	46	92	Strongly disagree
0	4	4	Unknown
			159. Most work is dull and boring.
36	21	57	Strongly agree
43	32	75	Agree somewhat
64	40	104	Disagree somewhat
33	36	69	Strongly disagree
0	4	4	Unknown
			160. You feel that your chances of having a happy home life in the future are good.
79	71	150	Strongly agree
68	40	108	Agree somewhat
19	10	29	Disagree somewhat
9	9	18	Strongly disagree
1	3	4	Unknown
			161. You feel that so far in your life you have been very lucky.
61	64	125	Strongly agree
64	33	97	Agree somewhat
26	18	44	Disagree somewhat
25	15	40	Strongly disagree
0	3	3	Unknown
			162. When people "bug" you, they should be told off even if it means getting into trouble.
41	26	67	Strongly agree
30	28	58	Agree somewhat
57	37	94	Disagree somewhat
47	39	86	Strongly disagree
1	3	4	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			163. You would say that you have a lot of confidence in yourself.
109	102	211	Strongly agree
53	24	77	Agree somewhat
7	2	9	Disagree somewhat
7	2	9	Strongly disagree
0	3	3	Unknown
			164. Most of your teachers had it in for you and gave you a hard time.
21	13	34	Strongly agree
32	18	50	Agree somewhat
62	31	93	Disagree somewhat
61	68	129	Strongly disagree
0	3	3	Unknown
			165. Most people cannot be trusted.
47	36	83	Strongly agree
53	36	89	Agree somewhat
50	31	81	Disagree somewhat
24	27	51	Strongly disagree
2	3	5	Unknown
			166. If you try hard enough, you have a chance of succeeding in whatever you want to do.
125	106	231	Strongly agree
41	19	60	Agree somewhat
7	3	10	Disagree somewhat
3	1	4	Strongly disagree
0	4	4	Unknown
			167. You feel that you are as capable and as smart as most other people.
82	62	144	Strongly agree
69	49	118	Agree somewhat
18	16	34	Disagree somewhat
7	3	10	Strongly disagree
0	3	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			168. What your family expected of you while you were growing up was:
13	14	27	Too much
16	24	40	A great deal
106	75	181	Just about the right amount
30	10	40	Not very much
11	7	18	Not enough
0	3	3	Unknown
			169. In dealing with you, your family was:
40	39	79	Always fair
66	41	107	Usually fair
61	45	106	Sometimes fair, sometimes unfair
6	4	10	Usually unfair
3	1	4	Always unfair
0	3	3	Unknown
			170. On the whole, how strict was your family with you?
9	6	15	Too strict
10	13	23	Quite strict
102	82	184	Just about right
39	23	62	Rather easy
16	6	22	Too easy
0	3	3	Unknown
			171. How interested were your parents (or other family adults) in what you were doing while you were growing up?
105	98	203	Very interested
66	29	95	Somewhat interested
5	3	8	Not at all interested
0	3	3	Unknown
			172. While you were growing up, when family decisions were made that concerned you, how often did they pay attention to what you wanted?
38	24	62	Always
43	48	91	Usually
74	42	116	Sometimes
15	13	28	Seldom
6	3	9	Never
0	3	3	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			173. When you dropped out of school, your parents (or other family adults):
7	7	14	Were in favor
133	107	240	Were opposed
20	7	27	Didn't care
11	5	16	Divided opinion (volunteered by respondent)
5	7	12	Unknown
			174. Compared to most of the young men who are your friends, you feel that you are getting along now:
24	23	47	Much better than they are
37	25	62	A little better than they are
89	72	161	About the same
17	5	22	Not as well as they are
9	5	14	Much worse than they are
0	3	3	Unknown
			175. Most of these friends:
63	54	117	Graduated from high school
66	37	103	Dropped out after 10th grade
46	38	84	Dropped out before finishing 10th grade
1	4	5	Unknown
			176. How many of these friends have full-time jobs?
20	12	32	All of them
73	44	117	Most of them
47	37	84	Some of them
32	26	58	Only a few of them
1	10	11	None of them
3	4	7	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			177. What kind of work would you really like to be doing 10 years from now?
10	8	18	Unspecified
49	45	94	Entrepreneur, Professional, Semi-Professional
9	8	17	Executives, Managers, Supervisors
15	13	28	Office clerical and Data Processing
3	5	8	Other clerical and Sales
2	3	5	Health, Welfare, Social Service and Technicians
51	35	86	Crafts, Trades, other Technicians
11	3	14	Machine operator
5	3	8	Factory work and semi-skilled
5	5	10	Other and unskilled
16	5	21	Unknown
			178. Do you think your chances of getting that kind of work are:
49	31	80	Very good
50	65	115	Fairly good
28	10	38	Not so good
23	13	36	Unlikely
26	14	40	Unknown and no occupational goal
			179. Is there anything that might hold you back from getting that kind of work?
62	75	137	Nothing holding me back
62	39	101	Inadequate education or training
3	1	4	Lack of job opportunities
3	0	3	Health, blind, weight, multiple sclerosis, speech defects
9	2	11	Police record
1	0	1	Past employment record
2	1	3	"Myself"
1	0	1	Inability to pass entrance tests
5	2	7	Other
28	13	41	Unknown

Baltimore	St. Louis	Total	Item Number and Code
			185. Does respondent have any obvious physical defects which might impair his ability to work?
168	123	291	No
1	3	4	Yes, amputated limb or member.
1	1	2	Yes, speech defect
1	0	1	Yes, wears glasses, blind in one eye
3	0	3	Yes, other physical problems
2	1	3	Yes, mental retardation
0	5	5	Unknown
			186. Interviewer's rating of respondent's attitude toward interview.
113	93	206	Friendly, cooperative
47	27	74	Casual, impersonal
9	7	16	Suspicious, reluctant
1	1	2	Hostile
4	0	4	Totally detached, non-involved
2	5	7	Unknown
			187. Interviewers' comments concerning interview.
148	118	266	No comments, or comments indicating that interview went well--"interview went very smoothly"
5	6	11	Accuracy may have been affected by respondent's attitude--"trying to give 'right' answers," "didn't care how he answered what you asked him"
23	9	32	Interviewing problems--"interruptions," "grandmother," "intoxicated," "child crying," "T.V.," "retarded," "done," "hurried."